EDITING AND INTERPRETING FARM NEWS IN THE METROPOLITAN DAILY

by

EDWARD LOWELL BRANDNER

A. B., Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1937

B. S., Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1937

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Technical Journalism

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1951

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

ETHICS IN FARM NEWS 3

The American Newspaper Guild's Code of Ethics 4

The American Society of Newspaper Editors' Canons of Journalism 5

A SHORT HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE 10

General 10

The United States Department of Agriculture 29

Program Agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture 34

Staff and Service Agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture 41

Criticism of the United States Department of Agriculture . . 45

A SHORT REVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS 52

SAMPLE FARM AND TECHNICAL TERMS THE FARM REPORTER NEEDS TO KNOW . 74

POLITICS IN AGRICULTURE 85

The American Farm Bureau Federation 109

Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union or National Farmers Union 113

The National Council of Farmers Cooperatives or The National Co-op Council 116

Order of the Patrons of Husbandry or The National Grange . . 117

Lobbyists 120

VOTES CAST IN THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON SELECTED AGRICULTURAL ACTS 128

VOTES CAST IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE ON SELECTED AGRICULTURAL ACTS 164

A LOOK AT THE PRESENT FARM PROGRAM AND SOME OF ITS FORERUNNERS . . 173

The Need for a Program 173

The Research and Marketing Act 183

TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THEORETICAL STUDY 186

SOURCES USED TO OBTAIN OPINIONS OF WORKING FARM EDITORS . . . 195

List of Farm Newspaper Editors Who Received Questionnaire, Alphabetized by States 195

List of Farm Radio Editors Who Received Questionnaire, Alphabetized by States 206

The Questionnaire 209

WHAT THE WOULD-BE FARM EDITOR SHOULD STUDY 215

Sample Comments by Farm Editors 215

A Proposed Agricultural Journalism Curriculum 223

WHERE AND TO WHOM FOR STORIES 229

Reference Books and Periodicals 229

Sources for "Tips" 234

Editors' Comments 237

OTHER TECHNIQUES AND QUALIFICATIONS 240

Importance of Photography 240

A Farm Background 243

A Broad Education 246

CRITICISM OF JOURNALISM STUDENTS 249

THE RADIO FARM EDITOR 250

Similarities with the Newspaper Farm Editor 250

Opinions of Radio Farm Editors 251

Books Recommended by Farm Radio Men 254

Periodicals Recommended by Farm Radio Men 255

FINAL CONCLUSIONS 257

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 263

REFERENCES 264

Books 264

Periodicals, Journals, Publications of Professional Organizations 264

Unpublished Material 266

Government Documents 267

Appendix available for use in Journalism Dept

INTRODUCTION

If this thesis attains its objective, it is well the objective changed after preparatory work was begun. To begin with, it was to report a study of farm news in the metropolitan or city press with an analysis.

Investigation showed that William B. Ward[1] had done a creditable job of analyzing and criticizing farm news in the United States newspapers in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Wisconsin in the 1940's.

That farmers subscribe to city daily newspapers and read them as avidly as their urban cousins was shown as early as 1919 and 1920 in research done by the United States Department of Agriculture and the University of Nebraska.[2]

After studying Mr. Ward's thesis and results of other studies already completed, it was decided to include in this thesis information to be used to teach "reporting and interpreting farm news in a metropolitan newspaper" in a course at Kansas State College called The Farm Page.

To accomplish this aim, the thesis must contain information gleaned (and dug) from source materials on legislation, economics, politics and other aspects of American life which vitally concern farmers and persons interested in rural life.

---

[1]Ward, William B., "Source Survey of Agricultural News in the Daily Press." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 1941.

[2]The University of Nebraska study of 1,338 farm homes in 1920 found "almost exactly as many subscribers to daily newspapers as there were farm homes." A year earlier the United States Department of Agriculture, in an extensive farm-to-farm survey, found seventy-five per cent of the farmers were subscribers to daily newspapers.

That alone might have made a good course--in theory at least--for the agricultural journalism graduate called upon to edit farm news in a daily newspaper. The writer felt, however, that the theory should be tempered with the judgment of actual working newspapermen now reporting farm news. To get this judgment, a questionnaire was sent to farm editors of two hundred eighty daily newspapers and seventy farm editors of radio stations.

Newspaper farm editors in each of the forty-eight states received the questionnaire. Only radio farm editors in the Midwest were questioned.

The first part of the thesis will report what the writer thinks is background information needed by the farm editor; the latter part, the results of the questionnaire.

ETHICS IN FARM NEWS

Although ethics should be a part of all training for agricultural journalism--or any other profession--it seemed appropriate that any material to be used in a college classroom might start with a code for newspapermen to follow in writing, editing and interpreting farm news.

As the American capitalistic society advances, it increases technical knowledge which, in turn, subdivides society into more groups that seek to maintain or better their positions. In this process economic power becomes closely identified with, if not directly related to, political power.

The newspaper man will come in contact with many of these organized groups. The farm editor will work so closely with one of these groups, agriculture, that he, more than many fourth estaters, must guard against identifying himself with only a segment of society--must constantly ask himself, "Is this for the general welfare?"

As the executive branch of the government has become more and more the policy-making and law-making branch, the economic and social advantages of belonging to a strong group have become more and more apparent.

It is no secret that agriculture is organized to at least maintain its position. The parity laws are based on that theory. The agricultural writer commissioned to interpret farm news to all segments of society will come under many pressures to become a pleader for agriculture rather than an interpreter for society.

He will need a code of ethics--instilled in the home, nurtured in school, practiced in life. Although the writer concedes that not all newspapers follow codes and canons of journalism, he thought it would have been presumptuous to have attempted to improve those already recognized.

Both the labor and capital segments of the newspaper publishing business have codes. That both stress practically the same ideals indicates that the general welfare cuts through specialized, technical groups that pressure legislators, Congressmen, newspapermen and others to plead their cases. Both codes are presented here.

The American Newspaper Guild's Code of Ethics

Resolved: 1. That the newspaperman's first duty is to give the public accurate and unbiased news reports, and that he be guided in his contacts with the public by a decent respect for the rights of individuals and groups.

2. That the equality of all men before the law should be observed by the men of the press; that they should not be swayed in news reporting by political, economic, social, racial or religious prejudices; that they should be guided only by fact and fairness.

3. That newspapermen should presume persons accused of crime to be innocent until they are convicted, as is the case under the law, and that news accounts dealing with accused persons should be in such form as not to mislead or prejudice the reading public.

4. That the Guild should work, through efforts of its members or by agreement with editors and publishers, to curb the suppression of legitimate news concerning "privileged" persons or groups, including advertisers, commercial powers and friends of newspapermen.

5. That newspapermen shall refuse to reveal confidences or disclose sources of confidential information in court or before other judicial investigating bodies, and that the newspaperman's duty to keep confidences shall include those he shared with one employer even after he has changed his employment.

6. That the news be edited exclusively in the editorial rooms instead of in the business office of the daily newspaper.

7. That newspapermen shall behave in a manner indicating independence and decent self-respect, in the city room as well as outside and shall avoid any demeanor that might be interpreted as a desire to curry favor with any person.

We Condemn: 1. The carrying of publicity in the news columns in the guise of news matter.

2. The current practice of requiring the procuring or writing of stories which newspapermen know are false or misleading which work oppression or wrong to persons or groups.[1]

The American Society of Newspaper Editors'
Canons of Journalism

The primary function of newspapers is to communicate to the human race what its members do, feel and think. Journalism, therefore, demands of its practitioners the widest range of intelligence, of knowledge and of experience, as well as natural and trained powers of observation and reasoning. To its opportunities as a chronicler are indisolubly linked its obligations as teacher and interpreter.

To the end of finding some means of codifying sound practice and just aspirations of American journalism, these canons are set forth:

I. Responsibility--The right of a newspaper to attract and hold readers is restricted by nothing but considerations of public welfare. The use a newspaper makes of the share of public attention it gains serves to determine its sense of responsibility, which it shares with every member of its staff. A journalist who uses his power for any selfish or otherwise unworthy purpose is faithless to a high trust.

II. Freedom of the Press--Freedom of the press is to be guarded as a votal right of mankind. It is the unquestionable right to discuss (for the benefit of the general public)[2] whatever is not explicitly forbidden by law, including the wisdom of any restrictive statute.

III. Independence--Freedom from all obligations except that of fidelity <u>to the public interest</u>[2] is vital.

1. Promotion of any private interest contrary to the general welfare, for whatever reason, is not compatible with honest journalism. So-called news communications from private sources should not be published without public notice of their source or else substantiation of their claims to value as news, both in form and substance.

2. Partisanship, in editorial comment which knowingly departs from the truth, does violence to the best spirit of American journalism; in the news columns it is subversive of a fundamental principle of the profession.

IV. Sincerity, Truthfulness, Accuracy--Good faith with the reader is the foundation of all journalism worthy of the name.

1. By every consideration of good faith a newspaper is constrained to be truthful. It is not to be excused for lack of thorough-

---

[1]Framed scroll in Kansas State College Department of Journalism.

[2]That in parenthesis and italics added by the writer.

ness or accuracy within its control, or failure to obtain command of these essential qualities.

2. Headlines should be fully warranted by the contents of the articles which they surmount.

V. Impartiality--Sound practice makes clear distinction between news reports and expressions of opinion. News reports should be free from opinion or bias of any kind.

1. This rule does not apply to so-called special articles unmistakably devoted to advocacy or characterized by a signature authorizing the writer's own conclusions and interpretations.

VI. Fair Play--A newspaper should not publish unofficial charges affecting reputation or moral character without opportunity given to the accused to be heard; right practice demands the giving of such opportunity in all cases of serious accusation outside judicial proceedings.

1. A newspaper should not invade the private rights or feelings without sure warrant of public right as distinguished from public curiosity.

2. It is the privilege, as it is the duty, of a newspaper to make prompt and complete correction of its own serious mistakes of fact or opinion, whatever their origin.

VII. Decency--A newspaper cannot escape conviction of insincerity if, while professing high moral purpose, it supplies incentives to base conduct, such as are to be found in details of crime and vice, publication to enforce its canons, the journalism here represented can but express the hope that deliberate pandering to vicious instincts will encounter effective public disapproval or yield to the influence of a preponderant professional condemnation.[1]

Modern science and modern industry, all-weather roads, automobiles, radios, daily newspapers and now television have changed rural populations. Their interests and those of urban populations are almost identical.

The highly specialized, technological world makes rural and urban populations more and more interdependent. The farmer can no longer live alone--any more than Kansas or the United States can live unaffected by international happenings.

---

[1]Scroll found in most daily newspaper offices and in schools and departments of journalism, including Kansas State College.

Citizens of the United States, of Kansas, of farms, of city apartments were equally avid readers of Korean news. They all saw it specifically effecting their lives. The farmer saw the Department of Agriculture do a quick about-face (out of cadence). It had been hinting at greater acreage reductions for 1951. With the Korean "incident," it began hinting that all restrictions would be removed and expanded production would be needed.

To the city homemaker, the Korean news brought vivid flashbacks of butter shortages, meat points, queues in front of food counters.

Farmers harvesting wheat on both sides of the 38th parallel in Kansas knew that what was happening along the 38th parallel on the other side of the world might eliminate new trucks, tractors and home improvements, take a hired hand or a son and still demand greater production. That war story and the story of World War II got topnotch coverage. Rural and urban persons understood the story and recognized their interdependence.

On the national scene in peace times they also are interdependent--much more than they realize. Their failure to realize their peace-time interdependence is partly the fault of newspaper reporters in general, farm reporters specifically. These reporters have not been constantly relating farm economy to the national economy and vice versa.

When General Motors grants a cost-of-living raise to its employees, the farmer may read how much more a new G. M. truck will cost, but he probably will not be reminded that the raise will give G. M. workers more money to buy more bread, meat, butter, eggs and other agricultural products.

The only way he could find out how many bushels of wheat it took to buy a G. M. truck before the war, how many it took the day before the cost-of-living price boost and how many it would take when that cost was added to the future truck produced with the higher paid labor would be to figure it out

for himself. Both he and his city cousin would be interested in that information.

Agriculture "fundamentalists" argue that the population would soon starve if agriculture should cease functioning, that agriculture is THE basic industry. They seem to ignore how quickly a railroad strike becomes a national emergency and that processing, financing and other elements of economic life also could have disastrous results by ceasing to function.[1] Apparently they have forgotten the Roosevelt bank holidays. The farm reporter who would try to prove the agriculture fundamentalist viewpoint should get a so-called public relations or lobbying job for agricultural interests. The ethics of his profession calls for keeping both eyes glued to the general welfare and showing the part agriculture plays in the whole picture.

Living up to codes and canons of journalism in the more complicated age of technology requires this kind of backgrounding and interrelating of interrelated facts.

It is little less than dishonest to tell only one side of a story--even when the story is one-sided merely from lack of information and pertinent backgrounding.

Some farm writers have done a good job of showing city people how much a quart of milk or a dozen eggs would cost them, if farmers gave this produce away. Few have pointed out also that produce distributed by farmers' cooperatives sells for about the same price as that distributed through normal channels--and dividends declared are comparable with those of other commercial enterprises.

The price of cotton during the Civil War was eighteen times as high in

---

[1] O. B. Jesness, "Postwar Agricultural Policy--Pressure Vs. General Welfare," Journal of Farm Economics, p. 7, February, 1946.

the North as in the South--because transportation had broken down. Whether a person is producing, processing, transporting, marketing or consuming farm products, he is part of the economic system that has produced the highest standard of living the world has ever known. Good reporters will erase national tensions by constantly showing the interrelation of these various segments of our society.

Otherwise, wittingly or unwittingly, newspaper men foster the deplorable attitude among many American groups that the only realistic policy is to get all you can. "Industry is doing it. Farmers have to." "Labor unions use pressure; so must we."

The farmer, the union man, the distributor, each is an important cog on the wheel of economy, but none is the wheel. Showing the relation of each of the cogs and that the entire wheel is the best one yet devised is the newspaperman's challenge.

In our highly technical world, presenting all possible conflicting opinions on a subject can no longer be called objectivity nor living up to a code calling for truth. In the butter-oleomargarine question that would have been merely giving readers all the distortions and all the partisanships of the dairy cattle industry and all those of the vegetable oil industry.

The American Butter Institute and milk producers' associations spent more than $150,000 during the first nine months of 1948 fighting repeal of the tax on margarine.[1] They, and the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers on the other side, continued the battle in Congress until the repeal law passed. Neither told the whole truth, and neither was thinking primarily of the general welfare in its fight.

---

[1]Helen Fuller, "Let's Look at the Lobbies," New Republic, p. 17, January 3, 1949.

The truth usually is somewhere between the extremes. Likewise the public interest lies between the two extremes. The newsman must view the distortations in the light of public interests; then try to show his readers how the gigsaw puzzle looks put together TRUTHfully.

The TRUTH in our complicated society is more difficult to find, but the need for it is as great or greater than during the times codes of ethics and canons of journalism were formed. With technical advances creating more segments of society, with these segments forming more pressure groups to work for their private welfare, stronger media working for the general welfare are needed. Newspapers are unique in being guaranteed freedom of press in an amendment to the Constitution. The guarantee was given on the American theory that people have a right to know the truth. Their right to know the truth depends to a great extent on the ability of newspapers to bring it to them.

Many semi-prostitute pressure groups will flirt with the newspaperman whether he is reporting news from farms, capitol buildings or ballrooms. Marriage to one of them should call for an automatic divorce from the newspaper profession. The two are incompatible.

Being given the title farm editor is not equivalent to being given a license to plead the case of agricultural interests. Getting and interpreting the truth to best serve the general welfare is the duty of the farm reporter, the same as all other reporters.

A SHORT HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE

General

The agricultural editor, the writer assumed without proof, should have an appreciation of the importance of agriculture, its problems, its traditions,

etc. These can best be gained by readings in the field. Marcus Porcius Cato was the first, whose writings have been preserved, to give the farmers a reputation which they still esteem today--some 2200 years later.

"It is from the tillers of the soil," he wrote, "that spring the best citizens, the staunchest soldiers; and theirs are the enduring rewards which are most grateful and least envied. Such as devote themselves to that pursuit are least of all men given to evil counsels."[1]

He admitted that trade is sometimes more profitable, but hazardous. Money-lending, likewise, might be more profitable, but less honorable.

> Our ancestors held this view, he said, and embodied it in their laws, which required that the thief be mulcted double and the usurer fourfold.
>
> And when they would praise a worthy man their praise took this form: "Good husbandman," "good farmer;" one so praised was thought to have received the greatest commendation.
>
> The trader I consider to be an energetic man, and one bent on making money; but, as I said above, it is a dangerous career and one subject to disaster. On the other hand, it is from farming class that the bravest men and the sturdiest soldiers come, their calling is most highly respected.[2]

Reading the history of agriculture around Rome before its fall, in Greece and in England, the farm editor will be amazed to see how treatises on farming then sounded so much like college extension releases of today.

> On soil management Cato wrote: The things which are harmful to cornland are to plough the ground when it is rotten, and to plant chick peas which are harvested with the straw and are salt. Barley, fenugreek and pulse all exhaust corn land, as well as other things which are harvested with the straw.[3]

---

[1]Porcius Marcus Cato, Roman Farm Management (New York: The Macmillan Company), 1913, p. 20. Translated by "A Virginia Farmer."

[2]Porcius Marcus Cato, On Agriculture (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1934, p. 3. With English translation by William Davis Hooper, revised by Harrison Boyd Ash.

[3]Cato. op. cit., p. 41.

Columella, only a little later, wrote "But of all the legumes, alfalfa is the best, because, when once it is sown, it lasts ten years: because it can be mowed four times, and even six times a year: because it improves the soil: because all lean cattle grow fat by feeding upon it: because it is a remedy for sick beasts: because two-thirds of an acre will feed three horses plentiful for a year.[1]

Early agricultural writers, besides realizing the value of fertilizing soil, even classified dung. That from pigeons was most valuable, followed by human excrement. That from goats and sheep was considered next best. Least valuable listed was horse dung.[2]

Those in the United States now emphasizing that farmers should get soil back in grass and produce more livestock might have taken a page from Marcus Terentius Varro, written Before Christ's time.

"The association between the ploughman and the herdsman is very close," he wrote, "inasmuch as it is frequently more profitable to the owner of the farm to feed the fodder on the place than to sell it, and inasmuch as manure is admirably adapted to the fruits of the earth, and cattle especially fitted to produce it, one who owns a farm ought to have a knowledge of both pursuits, agriculture and cattle raising, and also of the husbandry of the steading."[3]

Farm magazines and newspapers and radio farm editors of 1950 have used some of the same arguments in their columns of success stories (and other devices used to let the farmer see how his contemporaries gain success). Some writers, in fact, said farmers should buy cattle--or other livestock--to make more money by marketing crops on hoof.

---

[1]A Virginia Farmer, The Treatises of Cato and Varro Done Into English, with Notes of Modern Instances (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1913, p. 149.

[2]Ibid., p. 265.

[3]Marcus Terentius Varro, On Agriculture (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press), 1913, p. 309.

Like the county agricultural agents of 1950, United States of America, the agricultural leaders of Rome, Before Christ, were teaching "Fertilize your soil," "Improve livestock by breeding," "Take care of odds and ends during bad weather," "Get rid of noxious weeds," and "Do not overgraze your pastures."

Among Cato's suggestions were found:

> When the weather is bad and no other work can be done, clear out manure for the compost heap; clean thoroughly the ox stalls, sheep pens, barnyard, and farmstead.
>
> Manure meadows at the opening of spring, in the dark of the moon. When the west wind begins to blow and you close the dry meadows to stock, clean them and dig up all noxious weeds by the roots.
>
> Fertilizers for crops: Spread pigeon dung on meadow, garden and field crops. Save carefully goat, sheep, cattle and all other dung.
>
> Crops which fertilize land: Lupines, beans, and vetch. You may make compost of straw, lupines, chaff, bean stalks, husks and ilex and oak leaves.
>
> Terms for the lease of pasturage: The contract would state the limits of pasturage.[1]

On the selection of livestock, Varro gave advice which could well be followed today:

> As to form, sheep should be full-bodied, with abundant soft fleece with fibres long and thick over the whole body, especially about the shoulders and neck, and should have a shaggy belly also. The legs should be short.
>
> The most important point to watch is to have a flock from good stock. This can usually be judged by two points: form and progeny; by the form if the rams have a full coating of fleece on the forehead, have flat horns curving towards the muzzle, grey eyes and ears overgrown with wool; if they are full-bodied, with wide chest, shoulders and hindquarters, and wide long tail. The stock is determined by the progeny if they beget handsome lambs.[2]

On the other hand, the same Roman writers have since been proved to have used unscientific practices. All farming then was based on religious ritual

---

[1]Cato, op. cit., p. 53, 57, 67, 135.

[2]Varro, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 333.

to numerous and various gods, with feasts, fasts and other regulations. Modern medicine now seems as far advanced from Rome of B. C. 100 to 200 as industry of the twentieth century compared to oxen of those days.

The figure "3" in Cato's time seemed to have more agricultural charm than four-leaf clovers, horseshoes and all other modern good luck omens combined.

Cato's remedy for oxen used "3" of everything, had to be administered after both the patient and the administer had fasted and were standing.

> Remedy for oxen: If you have reason to fear sickness, give the oxen before they get sick the following remedy: 3 grains of salt, 3 laurel leaves, 3 leek leaves, 3 spikes of leek, 3 of garlic, 3 grains of incense, 3 plants of Sabine herb, 3 leaves of rue, 3 stalks of bryony, 3 white beans, 3 live coals, and 3 pints of wine.
>
> You must gather, macerate, and administer all these while standing, and he who administers the remedy must be fasting. Administer to each ox for three days, and divide it in such a way that when you have administered three doses to each you will have used it all. See that the ox and the one who administers it are both standing, and use a wooden vessel. Both the ox and the one who administers the remedy must be standing and both must be fasting.[1]

Varro's instructions included what nearly all American farmers today would label superstitions.

> He began a letter on farming with: Since, as we are told, the gods help those who call upon them, I will first invoke them--those twelve gods who are the special patrons of husbandmen. First, then I invoke Jupiter and Tellus, who, by means of the sky and the earth, embrace all fruits of agriculture; and hence, as we are told that they are the universal parents, Jupiter is called "The Father," and Tellus is called "Mother Earth."
>
> And second, Sol and Luna, whose courses are watched in all matters of planting and harvesting. Third, Ceres and Liber, because their fruits are most necessary for life; for it is by their favour that food and drink come from the farm. Fourth, Robigus and Flora; and when they are propitious the rust will not harm the grain and the trees, and they will not fail to bloom in their season; wherefore, in honour of Robigus has been established the solemn feast of the Robigalia, and in honour of

---

[1]Cato, op. cit., p. 81.

Flora the games called Floralia. Likewise, I beseech Minerva and Venus, of whom the one protects the oliveyard and the other the garden; and in her honour the rustic Vinalia has been established.

And I shall not fail to pray also to Lympha and Bonus Eventus, since without moisture and all tilling the ground is parched and barren, and without success and "good issue" it is not tillage but vexation.[1]

Like early Americans, Romans, before Christ's time, were nearly all agricultural men. Their greatest scholars and philosophers were those who owned and managed farms. Cato was a well-known lawyer, a great soldier, and one of the most prominent philosophers of his day.

Varro ridiculed and censored those who needed gymnasiums in the cities and villages for not getting exercise in the vineyards.

Nearly 100 years earlier Cato had observed that men who did not "depend on their farms for a living too often get the 'spending habit.'"

However, it was largely from England, Scotland, France and Germany America's farm heritage came. Persons from those countries settled America and brought with them the rural society that had been handed down to them in Western Europe.

In Scotland formal education had been recommended for Farmers as early as 1729. A professorship in agriculture was established in Edinburg in 1790. Societies for the improvement of cultivation had been founded in Scotland as early as 1723, in west England by 1777 and in London in 1793.[2]

A Farmers' Magazine was started in England the same year America won her independence, and The Farmers' Journal, a newspaper, in 1808. It was only 110 years ago, however, that the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society began to appear.

---

[1]Varro, op. cit., p. 163.

[2]Norman Scott Brien Gras, A History of Agriculture in Europe and America (New York: F. S. Crofts and Company), 1940, 2nd Ed., p. 226.

When the Korean war pointed to an eventual, if not a sudden, showdown between two opposed farming systems, it became more important for American farm editors to examine thoroughly the social and economic system they report and interpret.

Because the laws America still holds sacred and traditional were formed by representatives of the country when it was more than 90 percent agricultural, America's farming system was, and is, more important than its present 17 percent agricultural population indicates.

American farmers (and other property owners) are privileged with three attributes not known in the economic system of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. The American owner has undisputed possession against claims of other individuals. He is free to dispose of what he owns, and he is not obliged to make payment for using that which is his own.[1]

In contrast to this is Communism. Spreading over two-thirds of the world's land surface, it must be recognized as one of the most important systems of land holding in human history. England had somewhat the same system before the Revolution. The American Indians held land in common with no one claiming title. In fact, historians have pointed out that when Americans purchased land from the nomadic Indians they bought one thing, while the Indians sold another. The American purchased undisputed possession. The Indian sold casual hunting rights and the privilege of taking a crop now and then. That was the source of some of the misunderstandings that led to Indian warfare.[2]

---

[1]Other than taxes, which some think threaten to become confiscatory, the state has the right of escheat and eminent domain. Those three exceptions, plus police regulations the owner must obey, grew as society became more complex. If, or as, the "social viewpoint" grows, three of the four could be used to erase the first two privileges of American ownership. Taxes, some already argue, already exceed the old rents demanded by European states.

[2]Gras, op. cit. p. 253.

Those advocating socialism today would call the Indians' system Socialism. If Stalin were to succeed in laying down laws to govern America, it would be pointed out that the first Americans practiced Communism. Regardless of what it is called, it never has been both an economic and a social success.

The system is not suited to progress. It will assist in defensive warfare because a group can hold a fort better than a family can hold a farm. For the same reason, it is not suited to progress. It is more difficult to move a group than an individual, whether the group is an enemy army or the American spirit of progress.

As pointed out earlier, state college extension services are still attempting to get individuals to adopt practices recommended at least 200 years B. C. in Rome. Yet history has demonstrated that progress has come much more rapidly when it was tied to individual gain.

"Give a man the secure possession of a bleak rock," said A. Young, "and he will turn it into a garden; give him nine years lease of a garden, and he will convert it into a desert."[1]

Although free proprietorship was born in America, it had its forerunners in Western Europe from where settlers emigrated to the American colonies. America put landed property on the same basis as personal property, much of which had always been on this basis. Lower animals with any kind of organized society had at least personal property rights, so we should be safe in assuming that man has had proprietorship of personal property since the beginning of human society. Why then did it take so long for him to develop proprietorship of landed property?

---

[1]A. Young, Travels in France During the Years 1787, 1788, 1789 (London: G. Bell and Sons), Ed. of Betham-Edwards, 1905, p. 54.

Probably because it could not develop ahead of the idea that men are born free and equal. Although service rents on the lord's demesne were not extensive, they existed and were exacted in Egypt, China, Russia, Syria, Italy, Spain, and France.[1]

The manorial-feudal systems practiced so long in agriculture of other countries, had more than a vestige in early American tenure and grew into our system for landlord-tenant operations.

Americans have become accustomed to fighting wars for religious liberty, the idea of popular sovereignty (democracy), freedom of speech and press. They have failed to stress an equally important freedom--and one that now is being challenged along with the sacred freedoms mentioned above. That is free proprietorship of property. Realistically speaking, that little stressed freedom should be stressed with the others. It is more nearly 100 percent American than many of the others. Though taken for granted, it means as much to individuals as some of the other freedoms they are fighting to maintain.

Newspapermen should not overlook this truly American story so many people have forgotten, or at least take so much for granted that they do not mention it--even when giving soldiers reasons for going to war. In a war with Communism, free proprietorship should be one of the privileges along with other freedoms for which they are fighting.

Before the colonists left England they had gone through at least three enclosure movements, but they had not developed free proprietorship.

The first was started by lords and tenants under a town economy to provice for better cultivation and possibly for legume rotation or field-grass

---

[1]Gras, op. cit., p. 258.

husbandry. With the lands worked by everyone in common, and rotation to other strips of soil demanded by society, the person who planted legumes would have helped his neighbor more than himself, for the planters rotated on to other strips.

The second enclosure movement was instituted by the lords to get rid of tenants doing poor jobs and thus paying only menial rents.

The third, with which America is most concerned, was carried through by the rich and the greedy, the enterprising and the ambitious. Reason back of it was that scientific agriculture (rotation) might be practiced--and so the soil would yield more productive returns. Profits it offered to landlords and tenants was the real reason for its adoption. It brought about suffering and agricultural efficiency--the usual two chapters in the book of economic revolution.[1] It also did much to uproot men from a miserable existence in idleness, ignorance, and dependence on alms and theft.

The rich and the greedy became central characters in English literature of the day. The enterprising and the ambitious, however, also helped carry forward the new agriculture.

As a result, to many the agricultural revolution was not economic efficiency, not change in land tenure, and not literary culture, but the loss of well-being by the rank and file of country people. Yoeman and tenants became laborers. And the cottars and squatters, the traditional poor and laboring class of the village, suffered greatly when their holdings were enclosed for the new agriculture. They lost their cow, pig, and geese when the commons were enclosed, and instead of milk, pork, and fowl, they lived on

---

[1] Ibid., p. 226.

bread and tea.[1]

They also lost their fuel when the wasteland was enclosed. It probably was slight compensation for such losers to have plenty of work offered to them and to be compelled to accept it to keep body and soul together.

One generation paid for new gains for several generations, for the economic gains became permanent; the human suffering was temporary. To those who deal in reflections, it cannot be denied that the sufferers of that one generation have but one life to live. Each new gain brings with it a new discipline. That was the price paid in England for the agricultural revolution.

But it should be pointed out that the price, once paid, brought the agricultural revolution to England before France. During the 18th century France was losing population; England was gaining. France was remaining rural; England was being urbanized. France lost wars; England won them. France was having trouble avoiding bankruptcy; England was gaining in financial stature. France was in famines or near-famine; England had large surpluses of grain for export.

Later in England, a tenant paid a quit-rent to be free of some manorial service, like a penny to be free from plowing the lord's land.

When the King of England made grants to individuals or companies to colonize America, he was liberal with his donation of rights to induce the men or companies to venture for profit in the new world. The system was not accompanied by any agricultural service, but it did involve fealty, escheat and relief. The most important manorial incident, however, was the quit-rent. On the eve of the Revolution this varied a good deal, from two beaver skins for 60,000 acres in Pennsylvania to a red rose for 10,000 acres or

---

[1]Gras, op. cit., p. 228.

four shillings for 100 acres.[1]

Many Europeans came to America under an illusion. In the old world, with its agricultural economic system, land in itself was desirable. It would produce revenue and give the owner a life of leisure. Many came seeking the life of affluence and leisure. But they had only assumed they would have tenants. In the old country the land was rented to the tenant or the peasant cultivator who paid rentals to provide the landlord with a comfortable life in town.

In America this was not the case. The old system did not prevail in America until all the free land was taken. So the European immigrant, peasant or artisan, coming to get rich and live in leisure, had to go to work. He became both a landlord and a laborer, which the majority of American farmers remain today.

Among them were some able managers, but many laborers and artisans needed guidance. America gave them all 160 acres of land and crude economic conditions. However, the general rise in land values, as farms became settled, enabled them to hang on and concealed the fact that they were not really successful profit-making farmers. Society provided their only profits. They may have settled 160 acres, later amassed eight or ten such tracts of land to leave their children--without making more than a small percentage of the profits from farming.

But regardless of how he got to America or what his previous state was, he easily became a landlord and a laborer, once here. So the United States rapidly became a marked contrast to the manorial-feudal system from which it sprang. Under the old system the occupiers of the land did not own it.

---

[1]B. W. Bond, The Quit-Rent System in the American Colonies (New Haven: Yale University Press) 1919, p. 134.

Ownership was vested in the sovereign. That system permitted the sovereigns to build what are now such tourist attractions as the Palace of Versailles, the Louvre and many others. The sovereign political power was legal owner of all the land.[1]

The people in the manorial feudal tenement system held, in varying degrees of remoteness from the throne, the land they worked. Roughly, there were the sovereign, the tenant-in-chief, and the operating tenant. All three, and sometimes other ranks, were held together by customs, laws, obligations and rights. Thus the state was part of a social contract. The individuals contracted to do certain things and as a result claimed certain rights. State socialism is probably the nearest modern concept to compare with the feudal state.[2]

After they got to America there were at least four developmental periods of United States policy. As soon as New England got free proprietorship, the remainder of the colonial population held New England as its ideal.

The Federal government then established a rectangular system of marking land. Townships were to be 36 miles square (or 36 sections of land) with division marks following longitude and latitude. As we shall see later, when the political policies on land were developed, land sold for $1 an acre, $2 an acre, then $1.25 an acre without credit.

In the third period preemption was followed. The government, with the preemption law, declared itself in favor of the actual settler, against land speculators.

The Homestead Act introduced the fourth period. It was about as im-

---

[1]Except the allods which could be transferred only by inheritance within the family.

[2]Gras, op. cit., p. 256.

portant as a law can ever be.[1]

It was the guide to millions of ambitious, struggling settlers, and it was the consummation of a modern idea. Every real settler was to get free 160 acres of land. Full title was to be given after five years occupancy. This was a great triumph for genuine settlement, a great victory for the small estate, AND THE ENTHRONEMENT OF FREE PROPRIETORSHIP.

It might possibly be counted a benefit of the Civil War. For it was passed only after the South had withdrawn from the Union. Congressional leaders from the South had wanted the land in large blocks, suitable for estates and the slave system. The East, of course, wanted western lands sold so money from the sale could be used in lieu of taxes on the older settled region.

Laborers and the West advocated free gifts of land and small holdings. Regardless of how its passage is analyzed, it cannot be denied that it was the law that enthroned free proprietorship--one of the greatest distinguishing characteristics of the day between the United States of America and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.[2]

The Homestead Act later was modified; 320 acres was granted the dry-land farmer. And in one area where there was no water (Utah), the residence requirement was abolished.[3]

To secure free land was easy in America. To prepare it for cultivation often was laborious. To establish economic and other relationships, without

---

[1]Ibid., p. 274.

[2]Free proprietorship was actually established without using any term for it. It was first known in the United States in the Territory northwest of Ohio and east of the Mississippi in terms of the Northwest Ordinance--which also provided that in case of no will or testament, land should descend equally to all children.

[3]Later to become the earliest state with an estensive irrigation system, established under the leadership of the Mormons.

the old world, has been a slow task. Playing vital parts in the establishing were railroads, river steamboats, canals, telegraph, telephone, rural postal delivery, the automobile, radio, and television.

Until recently America had an economy based on plentiful land. For a long period it was the policy of the government to give the land away. Land grants were used to get the country settled. Railroads got great hunks of it. It was used to establish land-grant colleges and universities.

With a national history based on land enough to give it or provide it at very little cost to anyone who would settle it, land in America has been used lavishly. Where any item is cheap, it is always used that way. Where any item is dear, it is handled with care. Naturally, conservation is one of the big problems now facing farmers in the United States. Their forefathers pushed on to fertile acres, once fertility began to run out. Few were those who cultivated their land with care. Why should they so long as they could get more land by going west and merely settling it?

The new America used a system of natural husbandry. It required the least labor and capital--which were scarce--and used instead the land--which was plentiful.

Writers who criticize United States farmers for being too slow to adopt conservation practices, should remember that they are working against nearly 200 years of tradition, which is a heavy weight of inertia. The history of the plantation was the same: they declared land, imported slaves, exhausted the soil, moved westward and finally fought to maintain the slave plantation in competition with the free farm.

The Civil War, Gras has pointed out, was a contest in American agriculture. On one side were cotton, the southern slave system and the cotton manufacturing interests of England. On the other side were wheat, the free

labor system of the north, and the humanitarian cotton spinners of England, who chose to oppose slavery even at the cost of their daily bread.

Many explanations are given for why the North won: God, seapower and others. But Gras explained that it was more than a half-truth that the North won because of its wheat.[1] During the early years of the war England needed American wheat. England and the remainder of Europe had had a partial crop failure. So she needed American wheat more than she needed American cotton. The cotton kept the factories going, but the wheat kept body and soul together. England threw over its preference for the South and the idea of recognizing the Confederacy. The wheat of the North, at the moment at least, was more vital than the cotton of the South. The large wheat crop of the North was a material bribe to England to throw its influence on the same side of the scale with human liberty.

Du Pont de Nemours, a physiocrat (society should be governed by the natural order of things), helped negotiate the treaty between France and England that led to the recognition of the independence of the United States. Du Pont later moved to America where his descendants became famous for the manufacture of munitions.

His influence was only incidental to the recognition of American independence, but physiocracy (the rule of nature) had a strong influence on the agricultural history of the country. Physiocrats argued that nature ruled under certain unalterable laws which led to the increase, progress, and good fortune of mankind. To them the laws of nature should govern agriculture.

In England the physiocrats found no exact reflection, but they helped to produce Adam Smith, the generally accepted founder of political economy. And

---

[1]Gras, op. cit., p. 300-301.

they influenced leading Americans who traveled abroad. Benjamin Franklin, for one, studied physiocracy and was profoundly influenced by it.[1]

It was not their precise theory, but the general emphasis that they started that still comes blaring over town and country radios in political speeches preceding every Congressional election. S. J. Buck expressed their philosophy thirty years ago, when he wrote: "The clergyman prays for all, the merchant trades for all, the lawyer pleads for all, the representative legislates for all, the physician prescribes for all, the railroad man carries for all, the soldier fights for all, but the central figure, the cultivator, pays for all.[2]

Such a doctrine is preached in rural areas, echoed in Congress, is the meat and drink of rural politicians, the stock in trade of some representatives and senators. Whether townsmen or big business men like it or not, agriculture long has been considered fundamentally important.

However, the idea that it was <u>all</u> important was bringing severe criticism a quarter of a century ago. It was then that H. L. M(encken) said there is no more "grasping, selfish and dishonest mammal" than the farmer. His only political principal is "direct loot." He blackmails his customers with his monopoly of food, and is the worst speculator whom he denounces.[3]

Mencken's criticism was not justified, but it was a reaction against a false economic philosophy then being preached as doctrine. Long after it ceased being true, economists preached that good times on the farm meant good

---

[1]Jared Sparks, <u>Works of Benjamin Franklin</u> (Chicago: Townsend-MacCoun), 1882, Vol. VI, p. 279.

[2]J. S. Buck, <u>The Agrarian Crusade</u> (New Haven: York University Press), 1920, frontispiece.

[3]H. L. M(encken), Editorial, <u>The American Mercury</u> May, 1924, Vol. I, p. 292.

times for all. Just as false an economic principle now is being "sold" by the administration (Fair Deal) in an attempt to tie labor and the farmer together for a "fair deal" political maneuver.

Mid-twentieth century economists are quite well agreed that one segment of the economy does not carry or drag another into depression or prosperity. That all are related. When the farmer gets good prices for his produce, the laborer gets good wages for his efforts and the capitalist has dividends to distribute. But that one definitely causes the other is no longer accepted as will be shown later in this paper.

However, the pendulum has not swung so far that agriculture no longer is considered one of the basic industries. It just no longer is considered the basic industry.

There is no way to measure the industries that depend on raw products from agriculture. Cotton, woolen and leather industries, tobacco manufacturing, butter making, fruit and meat canning and packing, flour milling, and manufacture of alcohol are a few. Besides the manufacturer, all these products need to be stored, transported, distributed. All these industries must be credited to agricultural production. Still more are those that depend on agricultural consumption: farmers purchase foodstuffs, clothes, trucks, tractors, combines. These again must be manufactured, transported, sold wholesale and retail. And both production and consumption organizations taking raw products from the farmer and returning finished goods to him require credit, banking, insurance and other organizations that cater almost exclusively to that important segment of their society.

Agricultural politics and agricultural history are so near the same thing and so dependent on each other that it may have been unwise to separate the two in this investigation. Agricultural laws, one of the primary threads

in American agricultural history, will be discussed later as will farm organizations and societies and their influence on the history and politics of the United States.

But it was felt that George Washington's contribution to agriculture in the United States should be discussed here, for he stood first with the plow as with the sword. When the first president of the United States was chosen, more than 90 percent of our population was agricultural. It was only natural, therefore, that he was a farmer as well as a soldier and a statesman.

He may have been ahead of his time, but he was a business farmer. He kept books on all the 3,260 acres he cultivated. He studied the fields for their best uses, sought the best markets for his products--much as the modern farmer must today, if he is to succeed.

But Washington did not succeed. Although his system has since been adopted, he found it easier to win a war and independence for his country than to introduce a new system of agriculture. He tried new crops before they had passed the experimental stage and before they were adapted. He wanted his fields under scientific rotation instead of the old system of corn, wheat and an idle period.

He corresponded with Arthur Young and Sir John Sinclair, sought ideas, seeds, plows, laborers, a manager and tenants from England. But his plantation was too big for the new system. He had ignorant and inefficient help and an untalented manager. Like his acres, his animals were not of a good breed or condition. Had he not been away from home drawing up the Constitution and being president, he might have been remembered as the Father of American Agriculture. But he served his country better than he served his farm or himself.[1] However, Brook points out that visitors doubtless noticed

---

[1] W. E. Brook, The Agricultural Papers of George Washington (Boston, New York: D. C. Heath & Co.), 1919, p. 19-22.

what he was trying to do and may have been influenced to improve their methods of farming.

Washington, in 1796, recommended to Congress use of federal money to promote agriculture. Congress, however, did not act on the recommendation. But Washington's recommendation might be considered today the germ that grew into the present United States Department of Agriculture with all its ramifying branches--even including a dean of its Graduate School.[1]

The United States Department of Agriculture[2]

United States State Department employees started the work of the present United States Department of Agriculture. As they sent and brought seeds from foreign countries, the seeds were deposited in the U. S. patent office, a part of the State Department until the Department of Interior was created 101 years ago.

In 1836 (July 4) Henry L. Ellsworth became commissioner of patents. His interest in agriculture accelerated development of the U.S.D.A. Without authorization, but because he was interested in agriculture and farmers were asking for the service, Ellsworth began collecting and distributing plants and seeds. Three years later (1839) Congress gave him permission to use $1,000 for agricultural purposes, the first federal money specifically designated for agricultural purposes. And the $1,000 lasted several years,

---

[1] Dean Harold Howe of the Kansas State College Graduate School and an officer in the organization for land-grant colleges and universities Graduate School deans, said a Mr. T. Roy Reid attends annual meetings of the organizations and encourages Graduate Schools throughout the United States to send students to the U.S.D.A. for a year of graduate school credit doing research and regular civil service salaries for their work.

[2] T. Swann Harding, USDA Document Number 4, Revised, October 1, 1949. All of the material in this sub-division came from Mr. Harding's "Condensed History of the U. S. Department of Agriculture" and from talks with him while he was on the Kansas State College campus in June 1950.

according to Mr. Harding, the United State Department of Agriculture's official historian. A year later, however, his annual report indicated that 30,000 packages of seed had been distributed.

More simply, but as in 1950, Congress had been pressured by farm groups before the $1,000 was granted. In response to agricultural interests, the House of Representatives had set up a committee on agriculture in 1820; the Senate, in 1825.

Congress also authorized publication of a manual on the growth and manufacture of silk in 1828 and one on cultivation of sugarcane in 1830. The Department of Interior was created in 1849 with Thomas Ewing its first secretary. The next year "a practical and scientific agriculturist" was hired to write the report on agricultural matters. A little later a botanist and an entomologist were hired part-time. So we see the sprawling United States Department of Agriculture just beginning to crawl one century ago.

By 1852 farmers had formed the United States Agricultural Society to lobby for a national Department of Agriculture. It took the society ten years to get Congress to grant its wish with creation of the department May 15, 1862. Any amateur historian noticing the date can readily see a national crisis helping the society accomplish its aim. The Homestead Act followed in five days, and two months later the Land-Grant College Act became law. Eighteen hundred sixty-two was a great year for agriculture, though a year of crisis for the nation!

On the recommendation of Caleb B. Smith, Secretary of the Interior, Abraham Lincoln, in his message to Congress December 2, 1861, asked Congress for a bureau of agriculture and statistics.

Isaac Newton, first agricultural commissioner, did little for the office but give it a slogan of "making two blades of grass grow where one grew

before." That he adopted from "King of the Brobdingnags" by Dean Swift.

Few of Newton's immediate successors did much for the office until Norman J. Colman was appointed commissioner in 1885. Colman, with much agitation from the grassroots to help, succeeded in getting the experiment station law passed in 1887 and the Department of Agriculture raised to cabinet rank. He was the first secretary of agriculture, serving from February 13 to March 6, when he was replaced by Jeremiah M. Rusk, appointed by incoming President Harrison.

About this time the department began to gain status and significance. It also began to grow both in size and service. Because the complexities of agriculture were increasing, farmers found it necessary to have in Washington a strong, reliable department to serve them.

The Bureau of Animal Industry was founded in 1884 to "aid in the eradication of animal diseases." Its creation marked the beginning of modern research in the department. The Hatch Experiment Station act called for an office of experiment stations to carry on experiments in the states. The weather bureau was transferred to the agriculture department in 1890. It previously had been with the U. S. Signal Corps 20 years.

Beginning in 1897, the department had the same secretary for 16 years, James (Tama Jim) Wilson. His administration was outstanding for developing research in the natural sciences. Under him two blades of grass actually began to grow where one had grown in Isaac Newton's time.

In 1901 he formed the bureaus of soils, plant industry, forestry, and chemistry; in 1904, the bureau of entomology; in 1905, the office of public roads; 1906, bureau of biological survey.

Work in other lines was undertaken: agricultural engineering, dairying, irrigation, drainage, marketing, extension, and agricultural economics and

statistics. The growth of the department under Wilson is indicated by the number of persons employed by the department in 1897, year he took office, and 1913, the end of his term--from 2,000 to 12,704. Large numbers of the new personnel were scientists working in many fields to aid agriculture. They succeeded so well in Newton's dictum that it was apparent by 1910 that over-production might become one of agriculture's greatest problems. Market and credit conditions were becoming increasingly UNbalanced.

Then various regulatory laws began to be passed and handed to the Department of Agriculture for enforcement: animal quarantine, meat inspection and the food and drug act are examples.[1]

David F. Houston, who followed Wilson, introduced social sciences. Some studies in agricultural marketing, credit and economics had started before his time. But it was his administration that recognized and expanded these services and established appropriate staff officers in the social sciences field within the department. He built the foundation for today's home demonstration agents.

Passed during or immediately after his term were such acts as the Federal Highway, Farm Loan, Grain Standards, Cotton Futures, Warehouse, Migratory Bird Treaty, Packers and Stockyards, and Commodity Exchange.

In reorganizing the department, Houston set up a states relations service containing extension work, work in human nutrition and home economics and that at experiment stations. Houston, looking back, might be called a one-man New Deal in agriculture. Many of the ideas he planted were not acted upon until the "action days" of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. His dynamic period carried on into terms of his immediate successors: Edwin T. Meredith,

---

[1] Inspection of meats was not instituted to protect American consumers from diseased food but to meet the objections of foreigners to American meat products--or to help capture a foreign market. This is ably proved by R. A. Clemen in his The American Livestock and Meat Industry (1923), p. 323.

Henry C. Wallace (not to be confused with his son, Henry A.), howard M. Gore, William M. Jardine, Arthur M. Hyde and then Henry A. Wallace, whose term began only twenty years after Houston's began.

These secretaries and the agricultural department under them carried on work begun by Houston and effected consolidation and unification. Lest Roosevelt's administration get all the blame--or credit--for the so-called action programs, reports of the Jardine and Hyde administrations indicate that they saw the desperate postwar situation of the American farmer clearly, analyzed it and prescribed what was carried out beginning in 1933. The recommendations resulted in more farmers using more scientific methods and producing larger crops with less labor and more certainty. It was then the farmer began to realize that he was dependent upon other segments of society: transportation, labor, markets, credit, and other factors beyond his control such as land value and equipment.

The first world war had crammed a generation of progress into a few short years, put marginal land into the productive class (with its temporary high prices), produced inflated prices in farm products and land prices and resulted in deflation with its bankruptcy. The action agencies tried to make it possible for farmers to use up-to-date agricultural methods and knowledge in rehabilitating themselves.

They had not accomplished that goal until the effects of World War II led them to think they had accomplished it. Instead it was only another war starting again to bring higher prices and inflated land values--and demanding more and more food and fiber with less and less help. Farmers responded and established new all-time production records each year. They had learned scientific farming much better than the world had learned scientific living. Over-production again was the big problem until the Korean war. But this is

current history and is being analyzed daily in newspapers and magazines.

Meantime the Department of Agriculture has grown to such extent that it sometimes gets in its own way--has two or more representatives giving the same farmer diametrically opposed opinions. Perhaps the future agricultural writer could best understand it by looking at the department's organization and present statement of what it does and comparing that with the Report of the Commission on reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Program Agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture. The Agricultural Research Administration. The Agricultural Research Administration was established by executive order February 23, 1942, and includes offices of administrator, experiment stations, and the bureaus of agricultural and industrial chemistry; animal industry; entomology and plant quarantine; human nutrition and home economics; and plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

The administrator is to (1) administer research and regulatory activities, (2) coordinate the research program except for economic research, (3) cooperate with directors of state agricultural experiment stations to develop an integrated research program for the nation, and (4) administer research grants to state experiment stations under various federal acts.

The administrator determines research policy and integrates the research program of the department under the Research and Marketing Act, research on agricultural problems of Alaska, research on critical and strategic agricultural materials and provides operating services to agencies using the agricultural research center at Beltsville, Maryland.

The office of experiment stations administers funds for research in agriculture and rural life at state experiment stations, Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico; participates in planning and coordinating research among state

experiment stations and between state experiment stations and the USDA.

The bureau of agricultural and industrial chemistry operates the four regional research laboratories, tries to develop new and wider uses for agricultural products, experiments on uses of agricultural materials for industrial purposes and investigates biologically active derivaties of agricultural products.

The bureau of animal industry does scientific investigations on the cause, prevention, and treatment, control or eradication of diseases and parasites of domestic animals; breeding, feeding, and management of domestic animals, including poultry and tame fur-bearing animals. It administers the animal quarantine act, the diseased animal transportation acts, the meat inspection act, the 28-hour law, and the virus-serum-toxin act.

The bureau of dairy industry conducts scientific research on the breeding, nutritive requirements, and management of dairy cattle; the physiology of reproduction and milk secretion; manufacture of milk products; efficient operation of dairy plants. It also collects and analyzes production records of dairy herds and uses the information to promote herd improvements on a national scale.

The bureau of entomology and plant quarantine does research to develop ways to control, eradicate, or prevent spread of injurious insects and ways to use beneficial insects. This includes use of insecticides. It conducts programs to eradicate insect pests and plant diseases. It also enforces quarantines to prevent introduction and spread of new insect pests and diseases or those not distributed in this country.

The bureau of human nutrition and home economics does research on goods and services for everyday living, furnishes facts to help families get the greatest possible returns in physical and social well-being. Typical re-

search projects include nutritional requirements of the human body; nutritive properties of food in respect to proteins, vitamins, and other constituents; methods of home canning, freezing, drying foods; ways to cook and serve food; developing consumer specifications for standard-type fabrics for clothing and and household use; performance requirements of household equipment; budget plans for food, clothes, and other goods and services based on data from families of different income levels.

The bureau of plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering deals with plant breeding; improvement of crops; plant diseases; the sciences of soils, plants, and plant industry, including use of radioactive elements in studying fertilization and plant nutrition; practices and equipment for crop production; harvesting, transportation, storage, refrigeration and prepackaging of various plant products; surveying, classifying and mapping soils; farm structures and equipment; fertilizer materials, ways to make them and apply them. Headquarters are at Beltsville, Maryland.

The Commodity Exchange Authority. The Commodity Exchange Authority is to prevent price manipulation; prevent false crop and market information affecting prices; prevent hedgers and other users of commodity futures markets from cheating, fraud, and manipulative practices. It is to insure benefits of memberships by cooperatives on contract markets and trust-fund treatment of margin moneys of hedgers and other traders and prevent misuse of funds by brokers. It also is to provide the public with information on trading operations at contract markets. It supervises trading at eighteen commodity exchanges; has field offices in New York, Chicago, New Orleans, Minneapolis, and Kansas City.

The Extension Service. The Extension Service is the one through which the USDA and state agricultural agencies carry on educational programs in

agriculture and homemaking among rural people. It keeps farmers and farm families informed about new practices and new methods of farm production, marketing, and homemaking. It is to help rural youth become better citizens, farmers, and homemakers through 4-H clubs.

It sponsors programs that bring an appreciation of the values of rural life and the responsibilities of farmers to other segments of society. It also is responsible for fostering groups for the public study and discussion of broad agricultural problems and policies.

The Farm Credit Administration. The Farm Credit Administration is to provide complete cooperative credit for farmers and their cooperative buying, selling and business associations. This organization includes twelve Federal Land Banks with about 1,000 local national farm loan associations, twelve production credit corporations with about 500 local production credit associations. It also has twelve intermediate credit banks and thirteen banks for cooperatives. The national farm loan associations provide long-term land and improvement loans at 4 to 4½ percent interest with up to 33 years time. The production credit associations finance short-term operations; the bank for cooperatives, the cooperative buying, selling, and business operations of cooperatives. All try to avoid helping inflation by making appraisals on what they term "normal" values, i.e., what the farm or co-operative can be expected to produce in normal times and over a long period of time. They also urge farmers to pay off existing indebtedness rather than expand during periods of inflation. A cooperative research division is to help farmers' cooperatives improve efficiency.

They did not set up and start operating on these principles. The Federal Land Banks held mortgages on nearly half the farm land in many states during the not too late and still lamented depression.

The Farmers Home Administration. The Farmers Home Administration is to provide small farmers with credit to improve their operations and become owners. Farmers accepting loans must also accept individual guidance called "sound farm and home management," when necessary. Money from this source is available only when other lending agencies do not consider the applicant a good credit risk.

It is a merger of the old Farm Security Administration and the Farm Credit Administration's emergency crop and feed loan division. It can make loans only up to $3,500 for livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, family subsistence and other farm needs. Rates are 5 percent, but the loans may be for as long as five years. In other cases it can make loans up to 40 years to buy, enlarge, or improve family-type farms. These long-term loans bear not more than 4 percent interest. Repayment schedules provide for variable payments, according to farm income for the year.

As soon as he can finance through another agency or private source, the borrower must do so, if interest rates are not more than 5 percent.

The FHA also has charge of the loans to repair water facilities on small farms in 17 western states and the farm housing program set up for 1949 through 1952. This law authorizes $250 million in direct loans and other funds for minor repairs.

Farmers with losses from floods, storms, and other natural disasters also may obtain credit from the FHA.

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation does not blanket the United States, but it is a growing business. Last year it was authorized to insure wheat in 200 counties, cotton in 56, flax 50, corn 50, tobacco 35, dry edible beans 20. This year the program was to expand to 100 more wheat counties, 28 cotton, 25 flax, 25 corn, 17 tobacco,

and 10 bean counties. The same expansion program is authorized through 1953. One-third or 200 farmers (whichever is less) in a county producing the crop must ask for the program before it can be adopted. It also provides for a multiple crop plan insuring all crops a farmer produces. Protection is not to be more than the general cost of producing the crop in a given area.

Theory back of the crop insurance is to cushion farmers, local businesses and the national economy against crop failures. Premiums are to make the program self-supporting.

The Forest Service. The Forest Service is to promote wise use of the nation's forests and conservation of them. That gives it one-third of the total land area of the United States to serve. It helps with forest-fire protection, distributes trees and offers technical advice.

National forests alone total 180 million acres in 40 states and two territories. Administering them includes the development, maintenance and best use of timber, water, forage, wild life and recreational facilities. It also carries on research for improved practices in forest, range, and water-shed management and uses of forest products. The service maintains ten regional offices, twelve forest and range experiment stations with numerous branches, a tropical forestry unit in Puerto Rico and a Forest Products laboratory at Madison, Wisconsin.

Production and Marketing Administration. Production and Marketing Administration or old CCC has work laid out for it including administering production and marketing programs, agricultural conservation, production goals, acreage allotments, marketing quotas, price support, sugar, supply, marketing research, standardization, grading, inspection, market news, marketing agreement and order, school lunch, research, surplus disposal and other programs. It has local committees in nearly every farming county in the United States.

It also has state FMA offices and insular offices in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Its commodity branches include cotton, dairy, fats and oils, fruit and vegetables, grain, livestock, poultry, sugar, and tobacco.

The Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation now carries out price-support, foreign-supply, and other programs through the Production and Marketing administration.

The Rural Electrification Administration. The Rural Electrification Administration is another lending agency financing electric power to unserved rural areas of the country. Its loans are for 2 percent and run as long as 36 years. Cooperatives are its principal customers, but it also has loaned to public power districts, other public bodies and a few commercial power companies. In 1935, when it was established, 11 percent of United States farms had electricity. Fourteen years later 75 percent were electrified. However, only about half of the increase were REA borrowers. Others were served by commercial companies. It has done much to make farm life more comfortable and satisfying.

The Soil Conservation Service. The Soil Conservation Service is to bring about land use that furthers human welfare, conserves natural resources, establishes a permanent and balanced agriculture and reduces the hazards of floods and siltation. It works through soil conservation districts that must be organized and managed by landowners and operators under state laws. Practices are determined by surveys to find the land's capabilities and needs. These are judged by topography, soil types, degree of erosion, vegetation, rainfall and other factors affecting conservation. It also conducts a research program, through experiment stations and other organizations, to develop, refine, and improve soil and water practices.

Staff and Service Agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture. Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Bureau of Agricultural Economics is best known by farmers for crop reports that are immediately reflected by changes in prices paid for farm products.

Service from this agricultural agency farm editors could least afford to do without. It reports progress of crops, agricultural prices, and other aspects of agricultural production and marketing, prepares an annual outlook analysis and supplements it during the year with situation reports summarizing current commodity information. The situation reports are a must for the farm editor's price outlook stories.

Agricultural economics covers a broad range of topics, including agricultural production, prices and income (including parity relationships for prices and incomes), demand and supply, consumption, labor, farm management and costs, marketing, finance, land and water utilization, land values, transportation and others.

It also carries on studies of rural population problems and standards of living.

The Office of Budget and Finance. The Office of Budget and Finance does the accounting, auditing, budgets, purchasing, warehousing and distribution of administrative supplies. The farmer does not come into direct contact with the office. However, it works with the Congressional committees on appropriations. Its eight divisions include estimates and allotments; accounting; audit; corporate fiscal service; fiscal management; legislative reports; purchase, sales and traffic, and procurement and supply management. Naturally all these offices are in Washington, D. C.

The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is primarily to let the American farmer know the

foreign demand for and competition with his agricultural products. It, perhaps more than any other branch of the USDA, does most to show farmers their relation with the world. Not only are the farmer and other American segments of society interdependent, but also the farmer and other segments of our society are interrelated and interdependent with those of the other countries of the world. Through agricultural and other economic reporting officers of the foreign service, the office of foreign agricultural relations gets reports from other countries on crop production and prospects, livestock numbers, stocks, and trade in agricultural commodities.

It also gets information on food and agricultural situations in foreign countries and economic policies of foreign governments that affect the American farmer. After this information is compiled, analyzed and interpreted, it is issued to producers, business interests, officials of the legislative and executive branches of the government and to research and educational workers. The farm editor will want the reports. With them he may widen the horizon of his readers and show, with local examples, how farmers in his community and those in foreign countries are interrelated and interdependent.

This is the office that advises the secretary of agriculture on export subsidies, import quotas, international trade agreements, and other foreign trade agreements affecting United States agriculture. It, therefore, is a news source that can help analyze and project prices for farm products. The farm editor of the metropolitan newspaper should send requests to the newspaper's Washington representatives for stories from this office within the department of agriculture.

The Office of Hearing Examiners. The Office of Hearing Examiners holds hearings in rule-making and other quasi judicial actions required by law and performs other functions prescribed by various regulations.

The Office of Information. The Office of Information disseminates information from action, research, regulatory and service publications using newspapers, radio, motion pictures, exhibits, bulletins and other publications.

The Library. The Library resulted from the Organic Act of 1862 directing the secretary of agriculture to "procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture obtainable from books ..." The act makes the department's library the National Library of Agriculture. It is to gather and disseminate agricultural knowledge to "all those interested." It gathers and circulates books, pamphlets and periodicals, answers questions and issues the monthly Bibliography of Agriculture.[1]

Farm editors need not concern themselves with the Office of Personnel or the Office of Plant Operations.

The Office of the Solicitor. The Office of the Solicitor issues opinion on legal questions from administrative rules and regulations and provides a variety of legal services to the department of agriculture.

Mr. Harding makes the department seem much less complicated than it actually is. A graph outline of the various offices and bureaus follows for clarity--and oversimplification!!

---

[1]Farm editors on the mailing list spend a few minutes monthly checking the literature for possible ideas that could be developed in their particular newspapers and for stories that could be localized and featured.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION CHART

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL

Responsible for the personnel management program of the Department.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

Directs Financial affairs of the Department.

OFFICE OF PLANT AND OPERATIONS

Responsible for Departmental housing, etc.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Supervises the agricultural information activities.

LIBRARY

Maintaines an extensive collection of agricultural information.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Collects and disseminates agricultural statistics; coordinates economic research.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

Provides information on World's agriculture and foreign trade, exports and imports.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Performs the legal work for the Department.

OFFICE OF HEARING EXAMINERS

Rule making and quasi-judicial proceedings.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR RESEARCH & METG. ACT

Coordinates activities under Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Coordinates all research activities (other than economic) of the agencies of the Department.

Bureaus

Agricultural & Industrial Chem.
Animal Industry
Dairy Industry
Entomology & Plant Quarantine
Human Nutrition & Home Econ.
Plant Ind., Soils, & Agricultural Engineering

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

EXTENSION SERVICE

Carries on educational programs to assist people, primarily in rural areas, increase their technical knowledge so that they may develop more efficient farms, better homes, higher incomes and standards of living, desirable family and community life. Includes State colleges, county agent, home demonstration, and 4-H club work.

FOREST SERVICE

Promotes production of forest land and wise use of timber, forage, water, wildlife; administers national forests, forest and range experiment stations and the Forest Products Laboratory; cooperates in fire protection, tree distribution, forest management; ministers programs for utilization of forest products.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Administers a national program of soil and water conservation to conserve natural resources and establish stable and balanced agriculture. Program includes drainage, irrigation, water utilization, land purchase and sale, land development, and flood control.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Makes loans to cooperatives to furnish electric energy to unserved persons in rural areas; assists borrowers in the constructing and operating facilities; makes loans to cooperatives for the wiring of consumers' premises and the installation of electrical and plumbing appliances

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

Administers Commodity Exchange Act; examines commodity trade practices; investigates complaints and apparent violations of Act; supervises futures trading and conducts audits of books and records of futures commission merchants, floor brokers, and traders.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Provides credit system for agriculture by long-term and short-term credit to farmers; provides credit facilities, research and service for cooperative marketing, purchasing, and business service organizations.

Production Credit Corp.
Federal Land Banks
Intermediate Credit Banks
Banks for Cooperatives

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Administers, through supervised credit, real estate loans and production and subsistence loans to low income farmers and veterans; promotes ownership of family type farms; provides for equitable farm debt adjustment; and, administers a water facilities program in arid and semiarid areas of the United States.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Administers the Department's production and marketing programs, including agricultural conservation, production goals, acreage allotments, marketing quotas, price supports, sugar programs, foreign and other supply, marketing research, and regulatory activities including grading, standardization, inspection and market news; marketing agreements, and orders; school lunch; development of new and expanded markets and uses; encouragement of exports, surplus disposal.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION (Now in liquidation)

Responsible for stabilizing, supporting and protecting farm income and prices; orderly distribution of agricultural commodities. Activities include price supports, developing new and expanded markets, uses and marketing facilities; facilitating or making exports and developing foreign markets; operations are through Production and Marketing Administration.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

Conducts an insurance program to pay farmers for losses to crops from any unavoidable causes. Insures against losses to wheat, flax, corn, cotton, and tobacco crops on an experimental basis.

Criticism of the United States Department of Agriculture. As pointed out in a footnote at the beginning of the description of the department of agriculture and its functions, the immediately preceding information was from Mr. Harding. He was on the department payroll when he did it. Overlapping functions, divided authority and other weaknesses, though obvious in his report, naturally were not mentioned--much less stressed.

Many of the inefficiencies and abuses that come under various agricultural programs exist only because newspaper men in general, and farm editors in particular, have not exposed them through good, factual reporting with specific, concrete examples. Public opinion in a democracy takes care of many such organizational defects, once the public has the facts and examples to use in its campaigns through legislatures.[1]

Many of these facts, abuses, overlapping functions, competition between agencies, contradictory regulations and other inefficiencies were brought out in a study by some of America's outstanding citizens, The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.[2]

A picture story of a rancher using both pastures in the national forests (under the Forest Service) and lands on public grazing districts (under the Bureau of Land Management) quite probably would soon gain national circulation. Following publication of this, duplication probably would be removed by national legislation.

---

[1]The potato fiasco is a good recent example. Although the program was abused, potato supports were removed by the Congress convening following exposure of the abuses in local and national publications.

[2]The committee was composed of Herbert Hoover, chairman; Dean Acheson, vice chairman; Arthur S. Fleming, James Forrestal, George H. Mead, George D. Aiken, Joseph Kennedy, John L. McClellan, James K. Pollock, Clarence J. Brown, Carter Manasco and James H. Rowe, Jr.

The photographer covering the story could go with the rancher to the Forest Service office to get a permit to pasture lands under its domain. The agricultural writer could get this service's requirements and rates it charges the rancher; cover the federal employee as he reviewed the rancher's grazing resources and livestock plans before the agreement was signed. Then to the Bureau of Land Management and repeat the proceedings. The two make separate requirements, charge different rates of adjacent and intermingled pasture land. Best place for the story to originate is in the douglas fir region of the Willamette valley of western Oregon where these two government agencies are responsible for timber that is intermingled or adjacent on some 2.5 million acres scattered in checkerboard fashion on both sides of the valley. Two sets of regional and local forest officers work in the area carrying on parallel and duplicating programs that differ in some important details--like rates charged the rancher for pasturing the intermingled land.

"There has been long and wasteful conflict and overlapping between certain soil conservation, range, forest and allied services due to division of their functions between the department of agriculture and the department of interior."[1] Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management and, in some areas, Soil Conservation Service operate on adjacent or intermingled federal land areas under different statutory and administrative policies.

The general public does not realize this. They will when an agricultural writer worth a little more than the salt distributed for animals that graze these intermingled lands brings it to their attention. Until then rural and urban folks, alike, will continue to pay for the duplicating services--another example of the interdependence of the two groups.

---

[1] Report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Department of Agriculture, Herbert Hoover, chairman. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1948, p. 24.

The conflict extends to local governments. The Bureau of Land Management must ultimately return 75 percent of the gross revenues from its lands to local governments in lieu of taxes normally collectible, if its lands were privately owned. But the Forest Service returns only 25 percent of its gross revenues from the national forest lands to local governments.

Representatives of local governments, therefore, quite naturally favor letting the Bureau of Land Management control all the lands. However, the Commission's task force on agriculture recommended that the activities be consolidated and placed in the department of agriculture. And the task force on natural resources recommended consolidation and placing them in the department of interior or its successor.[1] Both task forces agreed on one point: consolidation. The taxpayer and the rancher probably agree and consider the difference of opinion on departments trivial.

Long-continued friction between the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture also has marred the planning and operation of irrigation projects. Reclamation personnel have taken proposals on irrigation to Congress before the Department of Agriculture people heard about them. Certainly the agricultural people should be consulted on the projects to see if they fill agriclutural needs.

There are so many separate field services at the county level that a single farmer conceivably could be visited by a dozen representatives of the federal government at once, or quite easily in the period of a week.

If he were training a veteran, the Veterans Administration on-the-farm supervisor would be there to check up on the training program. Federal-State employment service representatives might call to place another farm laborer. And, in harvest season, the Federal-State Department of Agriculture repre-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 26.

sentative might be in the field at the county level. The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine would have others there to work on plant disease eradication and insect control. Bureau of Animal Industry specialists would be there to eradicate an animal disease. Other federal agencies with representatives at the county level include Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, Farmers Home Administration, Production and Marketing Administration with its conservation payment and school-lunch programs. The Farm Credit Administration might have two representatives: one from a National Farm Loan Association; another from a Production Credit Association. If the same farmer were a director of a local cooperative, Farm Credit might have a third man representing the Bank for Cooperatives. If he were a director of a cooperative, he probably would be a director of the local Rural Electrification Association. So another credit representative might be added. Add to that the Federal-State farm forester. Any farmer would know better than to invite all of them in to lunch at the same time. But, through representatives, farmers and others have asked for all of them.

As farming becomes more specialized and technical, more technologists are needed, but it could hardly be argued logically that four agencies, for instance, should have credit men at the county level.[1]

Some of the above agencies claim to be self-supporting, but none has not had federal financial aid. The writer does not argue that their services are not necessary. It does seem, however, that one field man could represent more than one service; that less confusion and less contradictory information

---

[1] Named above, they are representatives of National Farm Loan Associations, Production Credit Associations, Farmers Home Administration, and Rural Electrification Association. This does not include the fifth hypothetical dinner guest also representing a credit agency, the Bank for Cooperatives, since it has no local field men.

would result if all these activities centered at the local level in a county agricultural board or similar organization.

The Extension Service has statutory authorization and obligation for all educational services to those not in residence at land-grant colleges of agriculture. Yet the Department of Agriculture has developed and fosters educational activities in many of its other sub-divisions. On this point the "Hoover Commission" reported:

> This multiplicity of education services has led to confusion on the part of the public, unnecessary expenditures of public funds, and actual weakening of the effectiveness of Extension Service programs.
>
> To assure the effective dissemination, interpretation, and application of the results of research, a revitalized and more aggressive educational and information service at national, state, and local levels is essential.
>
> In the interest of economy, elimination of duplication and confusion and more effective administration and execution, all educational and informational programs of the department and of land-grant colleges should be integrated, coordinated and executed by an especially designed, staffed, and equipped administrative agency.

Another recommendation of the Commission was that customs receipts now allotted directly to the Department of Agriculture be paid into the United States treasury and that direct annual appropriations be made by Congress for specified purposes.[1]

Some years ago Congress granted the United States Department of Agriculture use of 30 percent of certain customs receipts for various purposes. This arrangement obscures government accounting and side-steps the responsibility of Congress for appropriations. The commission believed it critical that Congress re-establish its obligation to appropriate all public money.

It also recommended the elimination of many duplications under the

---

[1]Report of the Commission on Reorganization, op. cit., p. 19.

United States Department of Agriculture. Chemical manufacturers, for instance, now must get approval from two or more departments. Those making viruses, serums and toxins for human use are approved by the Federal Security Agency. If the same viruses are to be used for animals (as they often are), the manufacturers must also get approval from the Department of Agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture, the Federal Security Agency, the Federal Trade Commission and the Bureau of Internal Revenue now all have regulatory powers and duties.

The United States Department of Agriculture inspects meat, animal virus serum, toxins, insecticides and seeds and supervises standardization of containers.

The Federal Security Agency (Under Food and Drug acts) regulates adulteration of foods, standards of containers, tolerances of poisonous ingredients of foods and various milk requirements. As noted, it regulates drugs, virus serum and toxins for human use.

The Federal Trade Commission administers regulations against false advertising of foods, drugs, therapeutic devices and cosmetics, and regulates branding of wool and fibre products.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue administers the prohibitory taxes on renovated butter and "filled" cheese. It formerly also administered taxes on oleomargarine for food purposes.

These overlapping regulations greatly confuse the public, the Commission contended. It, therefore, recommended that the United States Department of Agriculture is best equipped to do research in any of these fields, that all research be done by United States Department of Agriculture personnel and that a regulatory administration be established to administer all such federal statutes.

Other weaknesses in the present organization reported by the task force on agriculture include the twenty different offices reporting directly to the secretary--causing unnecessary diffusion of authority; agricultural activities in other parts of the government overlapping and duplicating those of the United States Department of Agriculture; too many field organizations on the local level resulting in duplication, overlapping and often conflicting policies. Another of the task force's most basic criticisms was that local advisory committees tend to become local administrative units and uncoordinated agencies instead of advisors.

To get away from local advisors becoming administrators, the task force recommended setting up state and county agricultural councils.[1]

The county agricultural councils would initiate programs and make recommendations to the United States Department of Agriculture. They would serve as advisors on agricultural problems such as research, extension, agricultural conservation, commodity adjustment, agricultural credit and others. All administrative work, under the task force recommendations, would be done by employees of the United States Department of Agriculture.

But few of the commission's recommendations, and still fewer of those from the task force on agriculture, have been carried out by Congress.

Congress will vote what the people want, but they will not know what they want until newspapers and other media let them know, in stories they can understand, what they have. The success of democracy depends on newspapermen probably more than any other group.

They handled the potato program rather swiftly--for a democracy. Although other programs may not be so flagrantly abused, good reporting will bring about desired changes. Like all other newspapermen, the farm editor

---

[1] Ibid., p. 65.

has a high calling. He must be a good reporter who gets, interprets and tells the farm story. With so much of the present farm program emenating from Washington, he will need to background many of his stories with economics, politics and history--wire services probably would meet a demand for help in interpreting the program and for on-the-spot news analysis.

A SHORT REVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Principal interests of people in all times during recorded history of the world has been how to make a living and what things affect a person's ability to make a living.

The ways that wealth is produced and distributed become more complex as technology advances. The more segments of labor and the more highly organized the segments are, the more complex is the system of producing and distributing wealth.

It has grabbed attention of philosophers from earliest writings to the present. No one will argue that America has the highest standard of living, the most highly organized labor and is the greatest producer of wealth. But systems of distributing that wealth vary widely.

Even farmers, least disturbed by the industrial revolution, generally know that they cannot live to themselves any longer. They, like all other individuals, are vitally interested in the processes of producing and distributing wealth.

Because it is so vital to everyone in the American community--and those in other countries unaware of its vitality--the economic history of American agriculture is an inviting field for study, a must for the forceful farm editor. If he is to tell the current history of the farmer and the story of his social evolution, the farm editor, it appears, must pay a great deal of

attention to economic activities of farmers.

The economic history of American agriculture is closely interwoven with other phases of history. Schmidt and Ross have listed some of the phases of American history included in an economic history of agriculture in the United States.[1]

> It includes much more than an account of progress in the technique of agriculture...It includes a study of physiographic conditions, topography, soil, climate, rainfall and drainage systems; Indian economy; the migration of settlers; the occupation of woodland and prairie country; the disposal of the public lands; systems of land tenure and tenancy; and the types of farming developed in each new area reached in the course of westward migration.
>
> It includes further a study of the westward movement of crop and livestock areas; the introduction and popularization of labor-saving machinery; the development of specialized farming; the transportation of farm products; the growth of markets; and the establishment of agencies for the promotion of scientific knowledge relating to agriculture.
>
> And, finally, it includes a study of the relation of agriculture to other industries--flour milling, meat packing, and transportation, markets, currency, banking and taxation; the relation of the farmer to politics and to legislation; the relation of the State to agriculture; and the influence of agriculture on the whole nation.

Stories telling and interpreting processes of producing and distributing wealth are no less vital today than they have been down through history. Therefore, it appears that the alert farm reporter will do interpretative stories on the use of improved machinery, specialized farming developing in his region or its possibilities of development, transportation, and markets. All are important phases either in the production or the distribution of wealth. The relation of farmers to national politics and legislation, likewise, are about 99 percent economic when analyzed. Farm organizations are for education, religious activities, amusement and entertainment--all to improve the lot of the farmer economically or socially.

---

[1] Louis B. Schmidt and Earle D. Ross, Readings in the Economic History of American Agriculture (New York: The Macmillan Company), 1925, p. 17.

Since America was largely agricultural until the 20th century, much of our history and legislation was merely expressing agricultural economic philosophy of the day.

Indian wars and treaties were to get more land for the farmer to make more money and improve his economic condition. Our land policy through the 19th century was based on a superabundance of virgin land. Getting it settled seemed much more important than how it was disposed of. Squatter sovereignty gave permanent possession to those who settled choice acres; railroads got grants of vast acreage. Colleges were established through land grants, etc.

A study now of that era shows that farmers made money from the rise in land values--although many, not analyzing it, thought they were successful farmers.

The liberal land policy fostered a speculative spirit that had to be curbed with national legislation, but the spirit remains among farmers, particularly west of the Mississippi. It has contributed, Ross and Schmidt think, to inflated land values and the present high rate of tenancy.[1]

The rapid disposal of land by the Federal government correlates with a rapid change from extensive to intensive farming and an increased cost of living. Other factors entered, but these undoubtedly were interrelated.

Transportation of farm products played an important part in the history of the United States, though, basically, transportation was--and is--an economic problem.

Roads, canals and railroads were aided by national legislation, grants of land, appropriations of money and general public support. Demand by southwest farmers for free use of the Mississippi river as an outlet for surplus farm products and the use of New Orleans as an export trading center

---

[1] Ibid., p. 19.

led to the Louisiana Purchase. Grain and wool producing states helped the protectionists under Henry Clay enact the tariff of 1824. It is generally agreed now that the contest between America's two opposing agricultural systems led to the Civil War. The South, with its aristocratic large plantation holders, slaves, and cotton, wanted the West to go under its system. Against these forces were those of small holders, free labor and diversified farms.

Immediately following outbreak of the war, came all the important land laws which brought victory for the farming class.[1]

The history of transportation and marketing of agricultural products is that of a competitive struggle between commercial centers for the surplus farm products of the Middle West.

Construction of the Erie Canal gave New York access to these products. Thus the Erie Canal was a victory for New York over its eastern competitors and over New Orleans. It still holds the head start it got nearly 100 years ago.

One hears much of the rivalry today among San Francisco, its neighbor to the south, Los Angeles, and to the north, Seattle. The three are competing for farmers' produce: wheat, livestock, fruit and lumber.

It has been observed that the agricultural economic policies of the United States have written much United States history.

For that reason it has been highly important that the public have true economic understanding to help its legislators pass sound laws. But this has not been the case.

---

[1]Previously mentioned in this paper were passage of the Homestead Act in 1862, the Morril Act providing huge grants of land for colleges of agriculture, the law creating the United States Department of Agriculture. At the same time came the great grants of land for construction of the Union Pacific railroad.

For instance, the Fair Deal's economic theory is that farm prices depend on full employment, wages and pay rolls. Whether this was only a political slogan to bring about a quick marriage of labor and agriculture for the expediency of the election or not, it has gained widespread publicity--largely because persons in high offices make news regardless of what they say.

Its falsity should have been exposed by farm as well as scientific writers.

"The current philosophy," according to Frank A. Pearson and Don Paarlberg, "that prices of food products in the United States are dependent upon a high demand for food as measured by full employment and high wages will prove to have been in error because it explains prices in terms of one factor--domestic demand."[1]

They contend that world demand is the factor affecting prices. It includes the demand of world laborers, doctors, lawyers, homemakers and children--a total of more than two billion people. Those who talk of high wages and high production in the United States consider only sixty million persons, about 6 percent of the world's workers.

Since prices of basic commodities throughout the world are interrelated, high wages in the United States to sixty million workers would have to raise demands among two billion people throughout the world for the fair deal philosophy to stand up under examination.

That point our current politicians will not be stressing or even mentioning in campaign speeches. That makes the farm editor's job more important. Since he will get no help from politicians trying to cloud the issues, it also makes his work more difficult.

---

[1]Frank A. Pearson and Don Paarlberg, "Sixty Million Jobs and Six Million Farmers," Journal of Farm Economics February, 1946, p. 38.

The politicians might point to wages and prices being parallel from 1929 to 1932. However, from 1880 to 1896 wages rose 15 percent; farm income per capita fell 18 percent.

Following the Civil War, prices collapsed with food prices falling 23 percent. During the same period wages rose 15 percent. From 1840 to 1849 wages rose 9 percent; prices fell 14 percent.[1]

From 1880 to 1896 wages in the United States, England, Germany and France rose from 12 to 26 percent; prices fell from 12 to 32 percent during the same period in the same countries.

Given these facts, farmers and other voters might not expect high wages to solve their economic problems. Answers to economic problems obviously lie beyond the horizons of two segments of society in the United States--agriculture and labor. However, those two segments would make a strong political factor to deal with.

Whether the politicians or theorists see their error or not, farmers already are learning that high wages of laborers have another effect other than making farmers prosperous. They are finding the tractor that formerly sold for $1800 with a $3200 price tag attached. The truck that the farmer formerly bought for $1500 now costs $2500. Judging from resolutions of at least some State Farm Bureaus calling for free prices and abolishment of farm sibsidies, farmers also are now realizing that it was illogical to pay tribute to virtues of free prices and later develop arguments for government controls.[2]

But the current economic theory is not the first false premise economists

---

[1]Ibid., p. 29.

[2]Kansas Farm Bureau makes those recommendations in its proposed legislative program for 1951.

have subscribed to. In early times, prices in the community were the result of local forces. Later national forces were considered important in explaining local prices. As our vision broadens, the relation of national and local prices to world prices will become more evident. It would, therefore, seem to be a duty of farm editors to point to world conditions and explain how they affect local farmers. If the editors do not do it, farmers may lose faith in farm news. For farmers already are aware that conditions in Korea, Germany, England and other countries react in United States market centers where farm produce and livestock are marketed.

Originally it was thought prosperity sprang only from the soil, and there are still a few single taxers who insist that soil should be the only property taxed. Following this was a period in which monopolies were supposed to make prices. Banking regulations were passed on the theory that prices of food depended on supplies of money. Nearly all the present generation can recall when theorists said the well being of the farmer depended on scarcity. In the Wallace era farmers were paid by the government to kill calves, pigs and other livestock and to plow under their crops to create scarcity that would bring prosperity. Fortunately that period did not immediately precede World War II when great surpluses were so desperately needed.

Like researchers using the trial-and-error method, economists have advanced first one theory and then another. Prosperity has been likened to the famous San Juan river in Central America which reversed itself. The economics of scarcity have given way to the economics of abundance. Prosperity which supposedly flowed from the farmer to the city is currently supposed to be flowing from the city to the farmer.

Economists who study the subject as a science instead of a political tool are quite well agreed now that the major forces affecting price levels

are: world supplies of and demands for commodities and money.[1]

Countries with similar currencies have similar price levels. Price levels in England and the United States for the past 80 years have followed a similar curve. Prices fell in both countries in the 1870's, 1880's and 1890's. They rose from 1900 for twenty years and fell together following World War I in 1921. Prices in other countries followed the same general course.[2]

Prices paid for United States farm commodities are affected by the same things that cause prices to fall or rise in other countries. Wheat prices paid for wheat in the United States have followed world price markets 100 years. Economists talk of exports and how they will affect the prices here. But they won't often interpret and explain that exports may be down because United States has its wheat or cotton priced above the world market.

"If the demand for foreign countries would cause more wheat or cotton to be sold abroad, prices would rise," they have said. What they meant was "If prices for wheat (or cotton) go up in foreign countries, prices offered in the United States will follow."

Without artificial supports, "If prices offered in other countries go down, they will do likewise in the United States," the economists also could predict accurately.

Wheat, cotton, pork and beef are considered non-perishable, but prices for such perishables (before dehydration) as potatoes, eggs and milk followed world price levels with only greater fluctuations even before they figured in world trade as dehydrated foods.[3]

---

[1] Pearson and Paarlberg, op. cit., p. 33.

[2] Ibid., p. 34.

[3] Ibid., p. 42.

There is little evidence, other than speeches by politicians, that wages make prices. There is, however, much to indicate that prices are one of the factors that make wages.

It appears that neither surpluses nor scarcities of United States farm products, high wages nor low wages paid United States labor nor any other purely national factor determines farm prices. It appears more logical that prices for farm and other United States products are determined by WORLD forces--the supply and demand for commodities and the supply and demand for money.

Certainly the old view that the ups and downs of agricultural production created the ups and downs of business is no longer true (although there might have been a measure of truth in that view when nearly all countries were largely agricultural). In the 19th century a counter influence began: non-agricultural business influences agriculture more than agriculture influences non-agricultural business. Now it appears to have gone beyond the horizons of any one country. The late Wendell Wilkie's One World appears to have arrived economically, if not politically.

Artificial supports, as on cotton in the United States, can remove a commodity from the influences of world supply and demand for commodities and world supply and demand for money, but these are the exceptions that seem to prove the rule.

The United States recognized this in a way, when she appropriated money for European recovery. It was pointed out that Europe needed money to buy American products. If Europe could not afford to buy the American cereals and meat products, American farmers suffered.

So the farmer has become a part of a world society. Demands for his goods fluctuates with business conditions (world wide). The farmer certainly

is part of the exchange mechanism by which human wants are satisfied.

Even if this economic theory is proved true, farmers realizing it and basing their activities on it will not solve all their problems. The great problems of rural communities are more human than economic.

They include economics, politics and social organizations. Rural schools, good roads, educational and social functions, land tenure, conservation, markets, capitalistic agriculture, rural credits and farmers organizations are only a few of the problems that weave together in the farm story--the story that needs interpreting in the metropolitan and as well as the rural press.

Metropolitan and rural society can no longer be separated. They are part and parcel of the same thing--or at least highly interdependent. Metropolitan economy is the result of many factors, but chiefly of the need for a wide exchange group to bring about specialization by individuals and localities. Both business and agriculture and specialized phases of each are required in the metropolitan economy. One cannot exist without the other.

Gras found that "Generally, if not always, in a social organization, the relationships between agriculture and industry are reciprocal.[1]

Agriculture does not simply support or help determine metropolitan growth, but is in turn profoundly influenced by it. True, cities like to grow close to rich agricultural lands so urbanites may have plentiful food available without exorbitant freight rates added to its cost. But agriculture, in turn, is profoundly influenced by the metropolitan center. It is near cities that one finds great milk sheds. Most highly specialized agriculturists also are found only near cities. A person 500 miles from a metropolitan area is not likely to specialize in raising rabbits for food.

---

[1]Gras, op, cit., p. 372.

However, that is a common practice of a few near the cities.

Agriculture is always most intensive near the cities and great central markets. It gradually grades off to the most extensive system at the outer fringes of the hinterland. Herds of cattle and flocks of sheep are not found grazing just outside city limits in a metropolitan area. More likely there are acres of strawberries, sweet corn, vegetables and other intensive (opposed to extensive) farming enterprises. Only in a metropolitan area is there a ready market for these farm products. So one sees a metropolitan economy bringing about many realignments. But they are secondary. Economic and social needs seem to be factors causing growth of metropolitan areas.

The first cities were formed at ports from which farm products could be shipped and into which goods needed by the farmer were brought. Later cities were terminals for waterways or railroads that helped meet an economic need.

The metropolitan unit is made up of a large city and considerable hinterland. The two exchange goods and services. One could not exist without the other. Both fill the needs of the other. One is occupied by agriculturalists; the other by business men and industrialists.

Their problems are much more alike than many realize. That is the reason there likely will be places for farm editors and writers on nearly all metropolitan newspapers of the future.

In addition to the two units being interdependent, more than 50 percent of today's urbanites have farm interests. Because it was not until the 20th century that more people lived in cities than in rural areas. These facts indicate a wide area of opportunity for the future agricultural writer.

The pioneer gave way to the cultivator (who also was an exploiter). In that process the United States lost a carefree, picturesque type of citizen. Life apparently seemed larger than work to most pioneers. The rich heritage

of cowboy ballads indicates that.

Now the cultivator is giving way to the business farmer--the one tied so definitely to the metropolitan economy of the United States and other countries. This new economy is bringing economic efficiency, while it is rubbing out a large group of persons to whom life was more important than money.

The business farmer realizes that time is money. The new era is bringing efficiency while it seems to be erasing that reflective attitude that developed a significant, if crude, philosophy of life.

Greatest loss to come from the new economic gain, perhaps, is the independence of the farmer. The more highly technical the society he becomes a member of, the more highly interdependent he becomes on other segments of that society.

Where he formerly studied only the weather, he now is learning the importance of markets. He takes a daily newspaper to study its markets. Instead of resting at meal time with his pipe, he now glues his ear to the radio for the market news. It may not be long until he sits in his dining room watching by television the market news develop in the metropolitan trading centers.

As the farmer becomes more dependent on other segments of society, he becomes more like persons representing the other segments. Economically he is moving up on the plane of the wholesaler, manufacturer, retailer, broker or business executive. Some will contend that the gain is more than offset by loss of independence, added worries, another move away from nature. But the farmer is so much a part of modern society that he has no choice of withdrawing. He has become a definite part of the cash nexus of society.

As such it is important that he understand the functions of speculators (and perhaps become one to hedge against future prices) and middlemen, tarriffs and other phases of the economic cycle of which he is so definitely

a part.

His fortune will still depend a great deal on the fortunes of the weather. But new rust-resistant, drouth-resistant, adapted crops are leaving him less at the mercy of the natural elements, especially rainfall. More and more markets are becoming equally important with the weather in the success of the farmer.

We now know that what is most effective is not the rainfall of the year but of the critical growing season, not the temperature of the year, but of the short growing and ripening season.[1]

Searching into the past, scientists have rainfall records in Arizona since 1392, one hundred years before Columbus discovered America. The records are written in the pines of Arizona. And the rings of the sequoia of California take us back to at least 1306 B.C. The fossil trees may some day give us a weather record for millions of years. Modern records have been kept in North Dakota since 1882, in Illinois since 1870, in Paris since 1690, in London since 1776 and in the Ohio valley since 1839.[2]

Knowing the weather conditions today, the experts in grain marketing and in agriculture now estimate from week to week how much the farmer is going to lose or gain during the year as compared with previous years. Their crop predictions, as every farmer knows, influence the week to week markets. Drouth and high hot winds normally will bring an upward change in the markets, unless the poor prospects are offset with better-than-average forecasts for another section producing the same crop.

---

[1] J. Warren Smith, "Speaking of the Weather," United States Department of Agriculture Yearbook, 1920 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office) 1921, p. 199.

[2] A. E. Douglas, A Study of the Annual Rings of Trees in Relation to Climate and Solar Activity (New Haven: Yale University Press) 1919, p. 84, 113

Studying the markets and weather reports from here and abroad, has become an essential part of mid-twentieth century farming. No longer do the largest money returns come from the careful choice of seed, proper rotation of crops and selection of the finest stock. If the cheapest buying and dearest selling do not accompany stock and seed selection, something far short of material success is inevitable.[1]

The heart of the subject of modern agriculture seems to be farm management. The departments of agriculture, agricultural experts, farm blocs and all others offering advice to the farmer could be abolished, and the business of agriculture would go on. As Gras said, "Give me a good manager and I'll take my chances on weather and markets. Without him nothing else matters."[2]

If all farmers were excellent managers, agricultural history would have been nothing much but a history of farm management. Many of the agrarian movements and the farm organizations would have had no reason for existence. They were largely to improve the economic lot of the farmer. Combined, their force could not have done so much for the farmer as good management.

Like the theory back of our various economic policies, farm management has had several phases of development. Looking back on them, it is easy to detect fallacies that did not lead to highest economic gains nor to the ideal social life for farmers.

Tracing the history of farm management through its phases, these weaknesses stand out prominently: great emphasis on increasing the size of the farm. More acres (rather than better conserved, better seeded, crop rotated acres) was the answer to all failures. The acres the failing farmer had were not producing enough income. The answer was more acres. But the answer, as

---

[1] Gras, op. cit., p. 355.

[2] Loc. cit.

time has shown, in many cases was better farming of the acres the farmer already had.

Better management then seemed to be such an obvious answer, that the United States farmer then went through a period, according to his advisers, of having no managerial capacity and being unable to use advice and information from the various offices set up to give much advice, but little help.

Western Kansas farmers during that era were advised by two or three of the federal "experts" to use crops in rotation that meant fallowing, when the federal experts thought they were giving the farmer a new crop.

Unadapted crops recommended failed. But generally, it was still the farmer's inability to take and use advice that was his downfall (in the minds of the experts).

The writer remembers going with two representatives of different divisions of the Department of Agriculture to a Ness County farm, long past foreclosure. The stock advice then was rotation. The farmer had tried wheat, milo and other sorghums, irrigated watermelons, irrigated potatoes and corn and had used twice as many crops as his neighbors--following advice. Getting more of the same advice, he asked, "What do you want me to grow--grapenuts?"

"Lack of an every day income" then became the diagnosis of all farm ills for a period. Now farmers know they must be more or less specialists. And specialties, such as growing certified seed, now are recommended.

Considered important now are accounting, cost and financial, budgeting income and outgo and taking advantage of markets by selling when they are up, buying when they are down.

In treating of farm management now, farm writers also are developing economics. This subject belongs to the town as well as to the country. It is another example of rural and urban interests being quite nearly the same.

Home management is an important study in many schools of home economics. It is becoming an important part of agricultural life and consciousness. The home, food, clothes, beauty, health and efficiency are important in any home, whether it be in the city or the country.

The home, perhaps, provides the best opportunity for the farm editor to appeal to his urban readers. Both segments, rural and urban, are a part of the same society, so interdependent in modern America it would be tragic for the farm editor to interpret his role as playing one against the other. Neither could get along without the other. Demonstrating that with interpretative, understandable prose would be a much better goal.

William A. Sumner points to more than 300 daily newspapers with farm editors for proof that "No one now questions that news of agriculture now concerns everybody."[1]

He compared interest in agricultural news today with that in early United States history when the population was predominately rural. Statesmen were farmers. Editors were close to the soil. Solon Robinson, for example, was farm editor for Horace Greeley, founder of the New York Tribune.

A nearby city is one of the three factors required, for instance, in a successful dairying district. Throughout the United States dairying has been a successful agricultural pursuit only where large towns and cities with good transportation connections are a part of the district.

Plenty of moisture for pasture and hay and deteriorated land, not good grain production are the other two factors. But the dairyman needs the city customers as much as the city customers need the dairyman's milk for their children. It is redundant to point to their interdependence.

---

[1]William A. Sumner, "The Press and Agricultural News," American Academy of Political and Social Science Journal. Vol. 219, Jan., 1942, p. 117.

The three factors mentioned would not equal success for a dairy in India. A fourth factor, too common to be mentioned in the United States, is that slaughtering animals for meat is necessary for successful dairying. The full meaning of this is better appreciated when one remembers conditions in India where Hindu religious sentiment is against killing cattle. Old cows and males must be kept until they die. In times of fodder shortage, all animals (good and bad) suffer greatly. Careful breeding also is very difficult. In general, cattle of India are useful for draft purposes and to a much less extent for milk which is "astonishingly and pitifully meager" there.[1]

Dairying perhaps is one of the best examples of interdependence between rural and urban populations. But the dependence of one group on the other exists regardless of what economic pursuit the farmer is in. The farm editor who shows this interdependence graphically and interestingly will find he has more readers within city limits than in the hinterlands.

Some writers have made proposals that perhaps would force the two segments to see how dependent they are on each other.

Skillin[2] and Fryer[3] propose taking as many as 4,000,000 farmers as part-time employees in industry. They would move the industries, schools, hospitals and homes to the rural areas. What they call under-employed farmers with too few acres could become a part of the new communities. Life Magazine in 1947 said there were 2,000,000 too many farmers on the land and that they should be withdrawn as speedily as possible.

---

[1] G. Keatinge, Agricultural Progress in Western India (New York: Harper and Company) 1921, p. 113.

[2] Edward Skillin, Jr., "Four Million Families," The Commonweal July 11, 1947, p. 302.

[3] See his book, The American Farmer by Harper and Company.

So it is easily seen that the economics of farming will continue to be an important part of the national picture. A sound background in agricultural economics might be as handy a tool for the agricultural writer as facility with the English language.

Probably the quickest way to kill off readers of farm news stories--or any other type story--is to use many statistics. Regardless of how sprightly the sentences that weave the statistics together, statistics and interest do not mix. Numerous readership surveys have proved this.

Required rote memorization of agricultural statistics by future farm editors would be the purest waste of time. It is much more important to know where to get up-to-date statistics than to know volumes of constantly-changing figures. Yet to measure the importance of agricultural events, to interpret them, and to relate them to other current events requires a general knowledge of crop acreages, numbers of various farm animals, rainfall expected, flooding stages of rivers, size of farms, values of farm lands and a myriad of other facts.

Acreages and yields of crops in one area, for instance, will affect prices of other crops and animals in other areas. Farmers and their city cousins want to know the relation of the two, what they will have to do with the price of beefsteak and other cause-and-effect phenomena with a direct and vital influence on the lives of both rural and urban readers.

Many urbanites, for instance, now have freezer-lockers in their homes or a locker plant a few blocks away. They now are interested enough in future prices of meats, vegetables and fruits to attempt to interpret the "six-point" market reports. They hope to stock their lockers during prices favorable to the consumer. Although the producer hopes to sell at the other end of the seasonal economic cycle, both are interested in the same thing: prices. An

interpretative story, based on statistics and an elementary knowledge of economics, is a natural for the farm editor to move from his section of the paper to page one. It also is a natural to show rural and urban interdependence.

For that reason, and because much of this information will be used in a Farm Page course, a few words on statistics were deemed essential.

During the 1949 Congressional debates on farm price supports, many urban and rural readers found that farm income had soared to $30 billion a year from a $9 billion annual income before the war. But it was up to Representative Clifford Hope of Kansas and a magazine read by thousands (rather than the millions who read the 30 to 9 figures) to point out that the average income of a farmer living on the farm was still only $712 a year compared with the $1,617 for the average non-farm per capita income.[1]

Hope, knowing that farmers butter his toast by repeatedly sending him back to Washington to plead their cases (which is his job as representative of a predominately agricultural area of the state) did not explain that the farmer raised much of the food consumed by him and his family.[2]

Both rural and urban readers would have been interested in a story interpreting these statistics.

But what does "an average farmer living on the farm" mean? An answer to that question belonged in the complete story. The United States has 6,000,000 farms that average about 175 acres each. But of this number more than one-half million farm homes are located on less than ten acres; nearly

---

[1]"Congress Debates Farm Price Supports," Forum, December 1949, p. 351.

[2]United States Representatives are even less obligated than United States Senators to represent, vote and fight for "the general welfare." There is no institutional reason, and far too few precedents, to compel a United States Congressman to have a national view.

two million average less than 49 acres each; more than three million range from 50 to 259 acres; 700,000 farm enterprises contain more than 260 acres each and nearly 50 percent of the total farm acreage.[1] Many of the 700,000 do not live on the farms they control.

Statistics, not interpreted, are meaningless; those interpreted by a vested interest, are worse than meaningless. And thousands of so-called public relations directors, managers, officers and their staffs are paid to interpret statistics to present their company's or their industry's best face to the public. Only a small percentage of professional public relations men know the truth is the best story to put before the public. With a farm background, agricultural training and an appreciation of farmers' problems, the farm editor must guard against becoming a mouthpiece for only the agricultural segment of his community. He must constantly dig deeper to get the "whole" truth.

The total farm income of $30 billion, mentioned earlier, was GROSS income. A huge gross income is not what stockholders look for in the "six-point" type of business pages. Instead they are interested in dividends paid from NET incomes. The peak farm NET income was $18 billion, reached in 1947. That was more than double prewar net incomes and more than five times that of the lowest net income of the depression years.[2]

Farmers had a higher GROSS income in 1948, but what they were buying that year cost more. Gross incomes for 1947, 1948 and 1949 were $30 billion, $30.5 billion and $27.5 billion. During the same three years they paid for

---

[1] United States Census, 1940, General Agriculture (Washington: The U. S. Government Printing Office) 1941, p. 251.

[2] Dale Kramer, "What the Farm Shooting Is All About," Survey, March, 1950, p. 127.

goods purchased: 130 percent above "parity" in 1947; 148 percent in 1948 and 142 percent in 1949.[1] But these statistics, while clarifying, compared to statistics on gross incomes alone, are merely trying to get at net incomes.

The 1950 model farmer is a business man. Among his successors will be more and more marketing experts. To survive in a highly competitive society --even with guaranteed prices through government supports--the future farmer will be forced to know markets. For that reason neither the farmer nor his city cousin will want his daily newspaper carrying gross income statistics-- except when the relationship between gross income figures and that of net income can be clearly shown. Then farmers and their city cousins will want to read those statistics only if they are interpreted so their meaning is clear.

Although they still are not available for study (fall of 1950), statistics from the 1950 census, interpreted, will provide many farm stories. Preliminary estimates place the total population of the United States at 150 million persons, but fewer than 25 million of these live on farms. The decreasing number of farms will correlate with the increasing number of tractors, trucks, automobiles and specialized equipment on the farms. In 1890, 90 percent of the population of the United States lived on farms. Between 1940 and 1948 the 6,000,000 United States farms increased in size an average of 14 acres each. During the same time, the horse and mule population, 27 months old and more, decreased 26 percent to 13,000,000 head. Average expenditures for farms and farm machines, excluding motor fuel, increased 150 percent.

Interpreting such figures would make interesting stories for both urban

---

[1] "Apropos Facts and Figures," Congressional Digest March, 1950, p. 80.

and rural readers. And they certainly should not be looked upon deprecatingly by the publisher. They indicate to his advertisers where their market lies.

Despite all back-to-the farm movements, farm populations are economically bound to decrease unless all production of machines and fuel for them is halted by war. A well-known farm leader recently said a wheat farmer adequately equipped with modern farm machinery can plow, seed, harvest and market more wheat than could 40 farmers with as many teams of horses forty years ago.[1] During the Revolutionary War period, it took 19 farmers to produce enough food and fiber surplus to take care of one city dweller. Today each farmer not only takes care of his own requirements, but is also able to supply these essentials to five other families engaged in other lines of work.[2]

The population of productive farm workers is estimated to have dropped 20 percent from 1940 to 1945. Despite the decrease, each of those years produced unparalleled records in agriculture. One-fourth of the total farm production went to the armed forces, yet total food supplies to civilians exceeded the 1935 to 1939 average. This indicates that starvation and an invitation to Communism could be avoided in vast areas of the world by modern farm machines in the hands of capable farmers.

From preliminary estimates of the 1950 census, it can be predicted that most Southern states will lose population while at least the West Coast will gain tremendously. This has been credited to the population shifts of the war. Yet analyzed statistics probably would prove it to be a century-old story of populations shifting from farms to cities. Southern states are the least industrialized. West coast states were the last to industrialize.

---

[1]Arthur W. Turner and Elmer J. Johnson, Machines for the Farm Ranch and Plantation (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948), p. preface V.

[2]Ibid., p. VI

Although populations do not shift across a continent with farmers moving to the city, populations always have shifted in the United States from farms to cities.

If the population shifts cause Southern states to lose population enough to lose representatives in Congress, farmers probably will lose part of the so-called "farm bloc" while industry will gain.

SAMPLE FORM AND TECHNICAL TERMS THE FARM REPORTER NEEDS TO KNOW

The story in a Chicago newspaper that a previous grand champion steer was the father of a later grand champion has been circulated widely. It illustrates the importance of knowing the meaning of farm words to keep farm readers from losing all confidence in the newspapers.

Many metropolitan newspapers today use "Thoroughbred" in describing dairy cattle, winning Herefords, dogs, and other animals. Thoroughbred is a specific breed of horses; a light race horse, nervous and high-tempered. The word the newspapers should use is "purebred." It can be used with any animal of pure breeding for any certain breed. Irish Setters, Jersey cows, and a purebred Thoroughbred.

Farm machines, likewise, have specific terms for description. Among those for preparing a seedbed are one-way plows, moldboard plows, disk plows, listers or middlebreakers, then disk harrows, peg-tooth harrows, spring-tooth harrows, cultivators, chisels or sub-soilers, rotary rod weeders, rotary plows, packers, drags, and levelers.

Used in planting crops are broadcast seeders, grain drills, many planters named for the seeds they distribute and plant-setting machines.

The farm editor also must know names of harvest machines used in his region. About seven machines, for instance, are used in harvesting hay:

mowers, rakes, loaders, stackers, crushers, balers and bale loaders, and choppers. A list of ten or eleven machines is easily compiled for harvesting forage and grain: binders, ensilage cutters, ensilage harvesters, ensilage blowers, pickers, cutoff corn harvesters, shellers, field shellers husker-shredders, stalk cutters and combine-harvesters.[1]

As the farms become more specialized and industrialized, they become more technical. Therefore, it appears that either formal training in agriculture or a farm background will become more and more a prerequisite for persons writing agricultural news.

Because he often is writing of animals and crops, the farm editor must know what a group of the animals or a quantity of the crops is called. Is it a herd, a pack, a drove, a flock? The terms, as all farmers know, are not synonymous.

Covey - of quail.

Flock - of sheep, goats, geese.

Herd - chiefly of cattle and larger animals.

Drove - chiefly of cattle or swine driven in a body.

Pack-- of hounds or wolves.

Bevy - quails, roes, larks, partridges.

Flight - various birds.

Crowd - implies pressing together and loss of individuality.

Throng - stronger implication of movement and pushing.

Horde - any crowd, swarm, pack; loosely organized group of nomads.

Tribe - a group of animals descended from some particular female progenitor, through the female line.

---

[1] Arthur W. Turner and Elmer Johnson, Machines for Farm, Ranch and Plantation (New York: McGraw-Hill), 1948, p. 8-72.

Bunch - an aggregate of things of the same kind as a group of animals; a flock or herd, as a bunch of cattle.

Roundup - to collect cattle by riding around them and driving them in.

Drive - driving together of animals for capture, killing or branding.

Rick - a stack or pile as of grain, straw or hay in the open air.

Stack - a large pile of hay, grain in the sheath, straw or the like.

Sheaf - a quantity of the stalks and ears of wheat, rye, or other grain bound together, a bundle of grain or straw.

Swath - path cut in one course; the windrow of cut grain or grass left by a mowing machine.[1]

Different terms, of course, are used to designate male, female, young, and gelded animals. The farm reporter, to speak the language of his news sources, must have command of these words. They are basic to his profession as an agricultural journalist. Female swine, for instance, farrow young. When used with female cattle, farrow has almost an opposite meaning: "Not producing young in a given season." "Farrow" is used likewise with soil. A field left "farrow" is not farmed for a crop that season.

The skeleton table below indicates a few of the many agricultural terms needed in the vocabulary of the farm writer.[2]

Both	Male	Female	Parturition	Young	Gelded
Fox		vixen	whelp	cub or pup	
Wolves			whelp	cub or kitten	
Panther	pantheress		whelp	cub or kitten	
Lion		lioness	whelp	cub	
Bear			whelp	cub	
Tiger		tigress	whelp	cub	
Cats			kitten	kitten	

---

[1] William Allan Newton, editor, Webster's New International Dictionary (Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam Company) 1949, various pages.

[2] Newton, ibid., various pages, and specialists in the School of Agriculture at Kansas State College, Manhattan.

Both	Male	Female	Parturition	Young	Gelded
Dogs	dog	bitch	whelp	pups	
Chicken	cock or rooster	hen	lay	chick	capon
Turkeys	cock or gobbler	hen	lay	poults	
Geese	gander	goose	lay	gosling	
Ducks	drake	duck	lay	duckling	
Guinea		hen	lay		
Horses	stallion or stud	mare	foal	colt	gelding
Cattle	bull	cow	calve	calf	steer
Buffalo	bull	cow	calve	calf	steer
Elk	bull or stag	cow	calve		
Moose	bull or stag	cow	calve		
Deer	hart	hind		calf or fawn	
Swine or Hogs	boar	sow	farrow	pigs	barrow
Antelope	buck	doe		kid or fawn	
Rabbits	buck	doe		sometimes kittens	

Although far from complete, the list indicates words many think are general in meaning and connotation have specific technical meanings. People who raise the animals will know the technical meanings. They will not respect writers or newspapers that use such common farm words incorrectly.

If wood is one of the products of the region, the farm editor must learn the woodman's terminology. His city readers probably think "jack pot" means a lucky night on a quiz program or with a slot machine. It is an "unskillful piece of logging work" to the woodman.

Other terms of the woodman include:

Bale - stem or trunk of a tree, usually the lower, usable or merchantable portion of the trunk.

Crown - upper part of a tree including branches with their foliage.

Deadman - a log buried in the ground by which a guy line is anchored.

Haywire outfit - originally makeshift repairs in harness; a logging operation that has poor equipment.

Seedling - tree originating from a seed in contrast to those originating as a sprout, root sucker or from a cutting. In applied forestry, seedling is such a tree under six feet in height. In forest-nursery practice, a seedling is a tree grown from seed and not transplanted to secure better developed root system.

Virgin forest - mature, uninfluenced by human activity or old growth.

Woodpecker or beaver - poor chopper.

Arboriculture - science and act of growing ornamental or shade trees.

Silviculture or forestry - growing trees as a forest for lumber.

Tree horticulture or pomology - growing trees for fruits, nuts, etc.

Ecology - study of effect of environment on plants and animals, and their influence on the environment.

Endemic - opposite of epidemic; confined to a limited area.[1]

To demonstrate the many technical terms needed by an agricultural writer, the author asked a Kansas State College specialist to define terms needed by those writing about irrigation.[2] His definitions of irrigation terms follow:

Alkali - a soluble mineral salt present in some soils in quantity detrimental to agriculture. These salts are usually sodium carbonate, sodium sulphate and sodium chlorate.

Auger - a tool used for sampling soil at various depth. In irrigation it is used for checking soil moisture.

Border - strictly speaking, borders are the small dikes or miniature levees running down either side of a level strip to confine irrigation water on the area. These strips are sometimes referred to as panels. In some areas irrigators use the word border to designate the strip between two dikes.

Box - irrigation structure, preferably concrete with bottom and four sides, used to quiet turbulent flow or to divide a head of water.

Canal - Main channel or ditch to deliver water to areas to be irrigated.

Capillary action - the tendency of water to rise in the fine openings in the soil.

Channel - natural or artificial depression, ditch or drainageway that conveys water.

---

[1] Trees, Yearbook of Agriculture 1949 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, p. 911.

[2] Walter E. Selby, Kansas State College extension agricultural engineer.

Check (or Check Dam) - irrigation structure in a canal or lateral usually of canvas or sheet metal, however, permanent installations of concrete with wooden gates are often used.

Corrugations - small flat-bottomed or V-shaped ditches or furrows, a few inches wide, running directly down the slope to keep irrigation water distributed evenly over the slope.

Diversion - change the course of a flow of water.

Division - separating water flows into calculated quantities.

Drainage - a system for removing free or excess water from a given depth of soil or sometimes from the soil surface.

Draw down - the difference in elevation between the static water level and level of the water level in the well while the pump is in operation.

Drop - structure used to convey water to a lower level without excessive erosion.

Dike - embankment of earth to keep water from spreading, or to confine water on a definite area.

Efficiency - the percentage of the water diverted for irrigation that is actually stored in the root zone of the soil.

Erosion - soil movement caused by irrigation water.

Evaporation - loss of water to the atmosphere.

Field capacity - the amount of water that can be held in the root zone of the soil, usually the top four to six feet of soil.

Flow - a given or definite quantity of moving water.

Flume - a rectangular or semi-circular structure for open flow of water, used to transport water across ditches or depressions or to a lower elevation.

Furrow - small channel or ditch between crop rows to distribute irrigation water to the crop.

Gate - rectangular or circular covers which may be raised or lowered in pipes, checks or opens channels to control the diversion of water.

Grade - slope required to overcome friction and produce the desired velocity of water flow.

Ground water - water contained in the soil.

Head ditch - the farmer's ditch or canal to distribute water from the main supply to the crop area.

Irrigation - the controlled application of water to crops.

Lateral - the field ditch used to distribute water to crops.

Leach - washing of soluble minerals out of the soil.

Lift - distance a pump has to raise water to the surface of the ground or to deliver it to ditch or reservoir.

Measurement - determining the amount of water passing through a measuring structure.

Moisture content - the amount of moisture in the soil at a given time.

Orifice - an opening of accurately known area used to determine or measure quantities of water.

Parshall flume - a rectangular flume like structure of accurate dimensions used for measuring flowing water.

Percolation - the downward movement of water through soil.

Permeability - the ability of the soil to take water.

Pressure - the thrust or weight of water designated in pounds per square inch.

Probe - a rod used to determine the depth to which irrigation water has saturated the soil.

Reservoir - a natural or artificial pond or structure used for the storage of water.

Run-off - the amount or rate at which water flows from an area of soil or a water shed.

Second-foot - a unit of measurement of water flow. It means that a cubic foot of water passes a given point every second. It is approximately equal to a flow of 450 gallons per minute or one acre inch per hour.

Siphons - tubes sometimes used to convey water over the ditch banks to row crops (these are true siphons). These usually range in sizes from 3/4 inch to 2 inches in diameter. Siphons 4 to 6 inches in diameter are available for use in irrigating borders.

Sprinkler - a system of overhead irrigation. For field operation there are three general types of sprinklers, revolving sprinkler heads, perforated pipe and eyelet hose.

Watershed - a sloping area from which water drains or runs off into one main drainageway or channel.

Weir - a measuring device of overflow type, consisting of a thin metal plate with a rectangular or V-shaped opening of accurate dimensions.

Wilting point - expressed as the percentage of moisture in the soil, at which time plants permanently wilt.

Much of the farm reporter's work will be making the technician's work understandable to the reader. As agriculture becomes more specialized, more technical terms, understood only by technicians, must become a part of the vocabulary of the farm reporter.

The technician, working indirectly for the farmer, and the man on the tractor or riding the range have only agricultural reporters for interpreters. Photographs, graphs, illustrations and other pictorial devices may be needed to tell the technician's story. So visual aids probably will become necessary tools of the farm reporter.

Pictures illustrating a story will do much to make it understood. The camera will not replace the typewriter, but it is rapidly becoming a necessary supplement.

While the reporter must know farm terms, he also will be teaching the farmer technician's terms. The latter is probably true in regard to some of the irrigation terms mentioned.

The Marketing and Research Act of 1946 will add more new terms with technical meanings to the farmer's vocabulary. It also should give new meaning to words carelessly used by the farmer's city cousins.

The marketing studies already are developing terminology for describing eggs. Few persons now buying eggs realize there are six classes of eggs with each class dropping three ounces a dozen in weight from the class above it. Under United States weight classes "jumbo" eggs weigh 30 ounces a dozen; peewees weigh only 15 ounces a dozen. Between the two and coming down three

ounces for each class are "extra large," 27 ounces; "large," 24 ounces; "medium," 21 ounces; and "small," 18 ounces.[1]

It is to the interest of both rural and urban persons to know that a dozen eggs can mean 15 to 30 ounces.

Today many in both rural and urban groups think AA, A, B, and C, which are terms for the quality of an egg, refer to the size of eggs.

The AA's are eggs that cover a small area; white is thick and stands high, the yolk is firm and high.

A's cover a moderate area; white is reasonably thick, stands fairly high; yolk is firm and high.

B's cover wide area; has small amount of thick white; yolk is somewhat flattened and enlarged.

C's cover a very wide area; white is thin and watery; yolk is flat, enlarged and breaks easily.

Coming from science, also, are recommended times of mating when hand-mating of animals is practiced; for mares it is the third day of estrus and each two days after; cows, twelve to twenty hours after onset of estrus and immediately after onset of estrus; ewes, during second half of estrus, which lasts thirty hours, or twelve hours after onset of estrus and each twelve hours after to end of estrus; sows, late on first day or in second day of estrus.[2]

---

[1] United States Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration, Poultry Branch, pamphlet 1949-O-839473, Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office.

[2] Science in Farming, Yearbook of Agriculture 1943-47, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office), 1944, p. 55.

New terms quite likely will continue to come from the government. "Production payments" was the proposed term to be used for the direct "subsidy" under the Brannan Plan.

"Marketing quotas" - two-thirds the farmers may vote marketing quotas on basic crops; that is, they determine how much of the crop each farmer should market to avoid abnormal surpluses. If the marketing quota is in effect, farmers who plant more than the acreage allotment or market more than their quota are subject to penalties. The penalties are fines paid by the buyer of one-half of the loan or support rate on the surplus commodity marketed.[1]

"Parity" has several meanings, and those it has, judging from the past, will change. But few urban persons seem to realize that parity, theoretically at least, is the ratio between the prices farmers receive for their products and the prices they pay for goods and commodities they buy. Urbanites buy many of the same goods and commodities.

The matter of parity presents a golden opportunity for demonstrating the interdependence of rural and urban persons. As seen by the definition and the way parity is computed, there is no such thing as parity for farmers only.

Parity is a measure of ratio between prices paid and those received by the farmer. Parity compares incomes of farmers with incomes of other workers.

If parity gets too low, the trouble probably is not on the farm. It more likely is low because city people and farmers must pay too much for some of the things they buy.

A competent farm editor, it seems, would soon have his city readers realizing that they are a very vital part of parity. The wages they get and the money they must pay for the articles they purchase are parts of the

---

[1]"Parity, Production Payments, et al," Congressional Digest, March 1950, p. 73.

formula for computing parity. Parity, therefore, is as important to city dwellers as it is to farmers.

Since prices are constantly changing, a base period is used to determine parity. The period is chosen arbitrarily. Until 1949 the base period had been 1909-1914. Currently it is the higher of that period and the period, 1939-1948. The second period is to follow a pattern of being the first ten of the last twelve years.

Here is an example of how parity is determined: suppose average market price for a pound of cotton during the base period was 45 cents; if the average of prices the farmer must currently pay for his basic needs is determined to be 30 percent higher than during the base period, the 30 percent is the "parity index." So the 45 cents is multiplied by 130 percent. The resulting 58.5 cents becomes the current parity price of cotton.[1]

Actually it is more involved, but that illustrates the principle. Prices rarely are supported at 100 percent of parity. Parity is like 0 on a thermometer. It is a convenient point of reference.

"Parity income" means substantially the same as parity. It is the ratio between net income of farmers and net income of non-farm workers during the same period of time.

"Acreage allotment" is the acreage needed to produce the amount needed of a certain crop in the "foreseeable future." Factors considered in arriving at the national, state, and local acreage allotments include production history of the farm, character of land, conservation needs, needs of the farmer, and other needs.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 73.

POLITICS IN AGRICULTURE

Since George Washington's time politics has played an important part in agriculture. But it has been only since Franklin D. Roosevelt took office in 1933 that so much agricultural news has come from Washington, D. C. Some contend that the New Deal repealed the law of supply and demand and made worthless all their training in agricultural economics.[1]

With government-supported prices, a knowledge of law and politics is as important to the farm editor as is economics. However supports have been used only to keep prices somewhat higher for agricultural products than the world demand makes them. For that reason, the writer does not think Congress will or could support prices much out of line with prices offered on the world market. The potato program, out of line, had supports withdrawn. The program would cost too much to operate, would remove American farm products from foreign trade, except through expensive subsidies, and would soon be corrected by Congressmen.

However, Washington has much to do with farm markets. A study of some of the important pieces of political legislation to come from Congress seemed appropriate to this student.

In his eighth annual address, December 7, 1796, Washington spoke at some length about agriculture:

> Fellow Citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives:
>
> It will not be doubted that with reference to individual or national welfare agriculture is of primary importance. In proportion as nations advance in population and other circumstances of maturity this truth becomes more and more apparent, and renders the cultivation of the soil more and more an object of public patronage. Institutions for promoting it grow up supported by the public purse; and to what object can it be dedicated with greater propriety?

---

[1]See letter from Farm Editor, Tulsa, Oklahoma, in appendix.

Among the means which have been attended with greater success are collecting and diffusing information, enabled by premiums and small pecuniary aids to encourage and assist a spirit of discovery and improvement. This species of establishment contributes doubly to the increase of improvement by stimulating to enterprise and experiment, and by drawing to a common center the results everywhere of individual skill and observation, and spreading them thence over the whole nation. Experience accordingly has shewn (sic) that they are very cheap instruments of immense national benefit.[1]

Washington had preceeded this recommendation by urging establishment of a U. S. Navy, the encouragement of manufacturing, etc. He followed it by urging that a national university and military academy be established. It is apparent that he felt a strong agriculture was necessary for the defense of the country.

Experimentation, collection and diffusion of agricultural information, he felt were ways of strengthening agriculture.

But it was nearly a quarter of a century later that Congress began acting on Washington's advice. By then it was pressure from farmers rather than advice from the Father of the Country, that Congressmen were recognizing.

May 3, 1820, "On motion of Mr. Williams of North Carolina, the House took up and proceeded to consider the resolution submitted by him on the 29th ultimo (sic), for the appointment of a standing committee to be denominated (sic) 'The Committee on Agriculture,' and the resolution was agreed to by the House; and ordered that the committee consist of seven members."[2]

Politically then, farmers had a recommendation from George Washington favoring their industry as early as 1796, but no action until 1820. The committee (in the House of Representatives) studied farm problems, accepted

---

[1] James D. Richardson, A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents 1789-1902 (Washington: Bureau of National Literature and Art), 1905, p. 202.

[2] Debates and Proceedings of the Congress of The United States (Washington: Blair and Ives), 1839, Vol. 7, p. 1839.

suggestions from its farmer constituents and provided a dumping ground for getting some suggested legislation off the floor. It was five years later before the Senate established a standing committee on agriculture.

Forty-three years after Washington's admonition (March 3, 1839) Congress recognized the farmer with an agricultural appropriation.[1] Then by a Senate act "to promote the progress of the useful arts," Congress appropriated $1,000 "for the collection of agricultural statistics and for other agricultural purposes." Two assistant patent examiners (work of an agricultural nature was done by the patent office) also were provided at the same time with $1,250 annual salaries each.

With the South aligned against the North, few laws or acts of any significance could get approval of Congress, until the South seceded. Then some of the most important laws for agriculture ever passed by any legislative body were enacted rapidly.

Even though they were considered at least partially "war measures," they were not rushed through Congress automatically even then. Entries in the Congressional Record show a House bill (No. 269) to create a Department of Agriculture February 17, 1862.

> Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled that there be established at the seat of the government of the United States a Department of Agriculture--general designs and duties of which shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.[2]

---

[1] The Congressional Globe, third session of the 25th Congress, (Washington: Blair and Ives), 1839, Vol. 7, p. 1839.

[2] Congressional Record, forty-ninth Congress, Second Session, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office), 1887, Vol. 18, p. 855.

The act provided for a commissioner to get $5,000 a year. He was to gather information from books, correspondence and practical and scientific experiments by collection of statistics and other appropriate means--to be permitted to use the franking privilege up to 30 ounces, and have a chief clerk for $2,000 a year.

"He might employ chemists, botanists, entomologists and other persons skilled in the natural sciences."[1]

Establishment of a department had been discussed twenty years. It had the direct recommendation of President Taylor, but no action on it came during his administration (other than discussions in the House of Representatives and in the Senate).

Abraham Lincoln recommended establishment of a Department of Agriculture with "agriculture, confessedly the largest interest of the nation, has not a department nor a bureau, but a clerkship only assigned to it by the government."[2]

The Secretary of the Interior had recommended its establishment and pointed to value of "crop and soil reports from every section of the country" and to furnish warnings on failure of crops at home and abroad, to combat insects, etc.

Owen Lovejoy of Illinois was chairman of the House committee on agriculture and one of the Congressional leaders working for establishment of the department.

Next day after its introduction, the bill was reported from the House to the Senate and referred to the committee on patents and the patent office.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 855.

[2] Ibid., p. 855.

[3] Ibid., p. 859, 861.

The same day Mr. Morrill of Vermont, Mr. Apaulding and Mr. Kellogg were permitted to record votes in the House in favor of the bill to establish a Department of Agriculture, passed yesterday.[1]

A month later (March 20) the Committee on patents and the patent office reported out the bill without amendment.[2]

Four days later (March 24) Mr. Wright moved to refer the bill (No. 269) back to the committee on patents and the patent office. It was agreed to and recommitted.[3]

Three days later (March 27) on motion of Mr. Simmons, it was ordered that the bill be printed.[4]

On April 10, Mr. Simmons announced he was instructed by the committee on patents and the patent office to report the bill with amendments. He proposed to call the bill up on Monday.[5] Arguments about making exceptions to too many bills and bringing them up out of order working against the legislative process, cutting down debate on whatever was being discussed--against the best interests of the country, particularly in "times like these" defeated his proposal to bring the bill up on Monday.

It was brought up and read April 17. The committee had amended it so fixtures of the office and the propagating garden would be transferred from the patent office to the Department of Agriculture. Another amendment made the chief clerk acting commissioner of agriculture during the commissioner's absence. A third amendment called for posting of bonds of $10,000 by the

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Ibid., Part II, p. 1261.

[3] Ibid., p. 1331.

[4] Ibid., p. 1390.

[5] Ibid., p. 1598.

commissioner and $5,000 by the clerks and the accounting of all monies.

Mr. Simmons spoke for five columns in the Congressional Record arguing for inclusion of "gathering and disseminating information on statistics in the Department of Agriculture--to hold down rumors, stop fluctuations of prices, for a secure nation, to keep farmers from being duped through rumors. He was cut off by another senator moving to consider another bill.[1]

April 22 Mr. Foster, arguing that with amendments, it was really now a Senate bill, moved to amend the bill so it would become Senate bill No. 269. While on the subject, other senators argued to keep the services in the patent office, to leave it alone. They pointed to added expenses of establishing another department.[2]

May 2, on motion of Mr. Simmons, the Senate resumed consideration of the bill. Consideration at that time was on an amendment by the Senator from Connecticut to make it a bureau in the Department of Interior. He argued that the next thing the farmers would want would be a secretary to sit on the President's cabinet. A special order of the day then superseded H. R. Bill 269.[3]

May 8, when the bill again was being considered, Mr. Simmons said the president of the National Agricultural Society was before his committee this morning with a petition praying that the Senate pass the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. Hale said pressure for a department did not come from men who lean upon their plow handles, but from men who want them to take their hands off the plow handles and vote for them at the ballot box.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1690-2.

[2] Ibid., p. 1726.

[3] Ibid., Part III, p. 1991.

Agriculture does not want any assistance, he said. Their prayer, if the genius of agriculture could be impersonated, to the American Congress would be, "For God's sake, let us alone."

Mr. Cowan argued that creating a department of agriculture would be unconstitutional. Half the seeds distributed will not grow in this country he said. At present they could get the same information for one-twentieth the cost at any seed store. He ridiculed the department's distribution of turnip and onion seeds.

Mr. Fessenden pointed out that a $1,000 seed appropriation had been increased to $60,000 in ten years, that there was no feeling among farmers for a department, that the president of the National Agricultural Society was a manufacturer.[1] It would be better to apply the $60,000 on the national debt, he said. Recorded vote on the amendment for putting a bureau of agriculture in the Department of Interior was yeas 18, nays 18, so the amendment was rejected.

The amendment to leave the number of clerks the same as those now employed was voted yeas 18, nays 18, so it was rejected.

The bill was then voted yeas 25, nays 18, so the bill passed May 10, 1862.[2]

May 13, the bill was brought before the House with amendments. It was rejected 90 to 14. May 14 the Senate received a message from the House that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 269) to establish a Department of Agriculture.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2015-2016.

[2] Ibid., p. 2017.

[3] Ibid., p. 2098.

May 20, a message from the Speaker of the House said that the President (Abraham Lincoln) had approved and signed on the 15th instant an act (H. R. 269) to establish a Department of Agriculture.[1]

The bill was three months in the legislative mill with little real opposition. But tracing it provides an idea of how the legislative machinery of our Federal government worked nearly 100 years ago--and how it works today. The bill did not drop out of discussion by being pigeonholed in a committee. It had relatively few opposing it. Relatively few amendments were added. It was not vetoed. It came in a time of emergency, yet it took three months!

Without agricultural writers among the Washington staffs of the wire services, farm editors of today will find it difficult to keep track of proposed agricultural legislation. Yet it appears that keeping their readers informed on the particular legislation that affects them most vitally would be the newspaper's duty in making democracy effective. Whether wire services do not have enough agricultural requests or if they do not agree on the importance of agricultural news created in Washington is not known. In a competitive society, with at least three major wire services from Washington, it appears that farm news could be had for the asking.

Although the present agricultural program is largely determined in Washington, William B. Ward found little farm copy coming from the nation's capital and no full-time agricultural writers employed on the large wire service staffs there.[2]

But back to 1862, undoubtedly the most momentous year for agriculture, in the history of the United States.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2157.

[2] Ward, op. cit., p. 56.

Laws passed in 1862 embodied the agricultural land philosophy and policies of the North and West. They had been thwarted in passage by representatives and senators from the South previous to its seceding from the union. Without this opposition to free holders of small plots, the Lincoln administration quickly passed the laws the North had long wanted. That they were victorious in Congress before they were on the battle field is a matter of recorded history.

Quickly, legislatively speaking, after the Department of Agriculture, came the Homestead Act.

It, the Morrill Act establishing agricultural colleges, and the Hatch Act establishing agricultural experiment stations were considered legislation so important that the Acts, in the language they were passed, should be included.

The Homestead Act (Approved May 20, 1862)[1]

An Act To Secure Homesteads To Actual Settlers On The Public Domain.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person who is the head of a family, or who has arrived at the age of twenty-one years, and is a citizen of The United States, and who has never borne arms against the United States Government or given aid and comfort to its enemies, shall, from and after the first of January, eighteen hundred and sixty-three, be entitled to enter one quarter section or a less quantity of unappropriated public lands, upon which said person may have filed a preemption claim or which may, at the time the application is made, be subject to preemption at one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre, to be located in a body, in conformity to the legal subdivisions of the public lands, and after the same shall have been surveyed: Provided, That any person owning and residing on land may, under the provisions of this act, enter other land lying contiguous to his or her said land, which shall not, with the land so already owned and occupied, exceed in the aggregate one hundred sixty acres.

Sec. 2. Be it further enacted, That the person applying for the benefit of this act shall, upon application to the register of the land

---

[1]Congressional Globe, Appendix to, (Washington: John C. Rives), 1862, Second Session, 37th Congress, p. 352.

office in which he or she is about to make such entry, make affidavit before the said register or receiver that he or she is the head of a family, or is twenty-one years or more of age, or shall have performed service for the Army or Navy of the United States, and that he has never borne arms against the Government of the United States or given aid and comfort to its enemies, and that such application is made for his or her exclusive use and benefit, and that said entry is made for the purpose of actual settlement and cultivation, and not either directly or indirectly for the use or benefit of any other person or persons whomsoever; and upon filing the said affidavit with the register or receiver, and on payment of ten dollars, he or she shall thereupon be permitted to enter the quantity of land specified: Provided, however, That no certificate shall be given or patent issued therefor until the expiration of five years from the date of such entry; and if, at the expiration of such time, or at any time within two years thereafter, the person making such entry, or, if he be dead, his widow; or in the case of her death, his heirs or divisee; or in case of a widow making such entry, her heirs or devisee, in the case of her death; shall prove by two credible witnesses that he, she, or they have resided upon or cultivated the same for the term of five years immediately succeeding the time of filing the affidavit aforesaid, and shall make affidavit that no part of said land has been alienated, and that he has borne true allegiance to the Government of the United States; then, in some case, he, she, or they, if at that time a citizen of the United States, shall be entitled to a patent, as in other cases provided by law: And provided further, That in case of the death of both father and mother leaving an infant child, or children, under 21 years of age, the right and fee shall enure to the benefit of said infant child or children; and the executor, administrator, or guardian may, at any time within two years after the death of the surviving parent, and in accordance with the laws of the State in which such children for the time being have their domicil, (sic) sell said land for the benefit of said infants, but for no other purpose; and the purchaser shall acquire the absolute title by the purchase, and be entitled to a patent from the United States, on payment of the office fees and sum of money herein specified.

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, That the register of the land office shall note all such applications on the tract-books and plats of his office, and keep a register of all such entries, and make return thereof to the General Land Office, together with the proof upon which they have been founded.

Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That no lands acquired under the provisions of this act shall in any event become liable to the satisfaction of any debt or debts contracted prior to the issuing of the patent therefor.

Sec. 5. And be it further enacted, That if, at any time after the filing of the affidavit, as required in the second section of this act, and before the expiration of the five years aforesaid, it shall be proven, after due notice to the settler, to the satisfaction of the register of the land office, that the person having filed such affidavit

shall have actually changed his or her residence, or abandoned the said land for more than six months at any time, then and in that event the land so entered shall revert to the Government.

Sec. 6. And be it further enacted, That no individual shall be permitted to acquire title to more than one quarter section under the provisions of this act; and that the Commissioner of the General Land Office is hereby required to prepare and issue such rules and regulations, consistent with this act, as shall be necessary and proper to carry its provisions into effect; and that the registers and receivers of the several land offices shall be entitled to receive the same compensation for any lands entered under the provisions of this act that they are now entitled to receive when same quantity of land is entered with money, one half to be paid by the person making the application at the time of so doing, and the other half on the issue of the certificate by the person to whom it may be issued; but this shall not be construed to enlarge the maximum of compensation now prescribed by law for any register, or receiver; Provided, That nothing contained in this act shall be so construed as to impair or interfere in any manner whatever with existing preemption rights; And provided further, That all persons who may have filed their applications for a preemption right prior to the passage of this act, shall be entitled to all the privileges of this act: Provided further, That no person who has served, or may hereafter serve, for a period of not less than fourteen days in the Army or Navy of the United States, either regular or volunteer, under the laws thereof, during the existence of an actual war, domestic or foreign, shall be deprived of the benefits of this act on account of not having attained the age of 21 years.

Sec. 7. And be it further enacted, That the fifth section of the act entitled, "An act in addition to an act more effectually to provide for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States, and for other purposes," approved the third of March in the year 1857, shall extend to all oaths, affirmations, and affidavits, required or authorized by this act.

Sec. 8. And be it further enacted, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to prevent any person who has availed him or herself of the benefits of the first section of this act from paying the minimum price, or the price to which the same may have graduated, for the quantity of land so entered at any time before the expiration of the five years, and obtaining a patent therefor from the Government, as in other cases provided by law, on making proof of settlement and cultivation as provided by existing laws granting preemption rights.

The Morrill Act (Signed by A. Lincoln July 1, 1862)[1]

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That there be granted to the

---

[1] Ibid., July 1, 1862.

several States, for purposes hereinafter mentioned, an amount of public land, to be apportioned to each State a quantity equal to thirty thousand acres for each Senator and Representative in Congress to which the States are respectively entitled by the apportionment under the census of 1860: Provided, that no mineral lands shall be selected or purchased under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That the land aforesaid, after being surveyed, shall be apportioned to the several states in sections or subdivisions of sections, not less than one quarter of a section; and whenever there are public lands in a State subject to sale at private entry at one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre, the quantity to which said State shall be entitled shall be selected from such lands within the limits of such State, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to issue to each of the States in which there is not the quantity of public lands subject to sale at private entry at $1.25 per acre, to which said State may be entitled under the provisions of this act, land scrip to the amount in acres for the deficiency of its distributive share; said scrip to be sold by said States, and the proceeds thereof applied to the uses and purposes prescribed in this act, and for no other use or purpose whatsoever: Provided, That in no case shall any State to which land scrip may thus be issued be allowed to locate the same within the limits of any State, or of any Territory of the United States, but their assignees may thus locate said land scrip upon any of the unappropriated lands of the United States subject to sale at private entry at $1.25, or less, an acre: And provided further, That not more than one million acres shall be located by such assignees in any of the States: And provided further, That no such location shall be made before one year from the passage of this act.

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, That all the expenses of management, superintendence and taxes from date of selection of said lands, previous to their sales, and all expenses incurred in the management and disbursement of the moneys which may be received therefrom, shall be paid by the States to which they may belong, out of the treasury of said States, so that the entire proceeds of the sale of said lands shall be applied without any diminution whatever to the purposes hereinafter mentioned.

Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That all monies derived from the sale of the lands aforesaid by the States to which the lands are apportioned, and from the sales of land scrip hereinbefore provided for, shall be invested in stocks of the United States or of the States, or some other safe stocks, yielding not less than five per centum upon the par value of said stocks; and that the monies so invested shall constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished, (except so far as may be provided in section fifth of this act,) and the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated, by each State which may take and claim the benefit of this act, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading subject shall be without excluding other scientific and

classical studies, and including military tactics, to such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the Legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.[1]

Sec. 5. And be it further enacted, That the grant of land and land scrip hereby authorized shall be made on the following conditions, to which, as well as the provisions hereinbefore contained the previous assent of the several States shall be signified by legislative acts:

First, If any portion of the fund invested, as provided by the foregoing section, or any portion of the interest thereon, shall, by any action or contingency, be diminished or lost, it shall be replaced by the State to which it belongs, so that the capital of the fund shall remain forever undiminished; and the annual interest shall be regularly applied without diminution to the purposes mentioned in the fourth section of this act, except that a sum, not exceeding ten per centum upon the amount received by any State under the provisions of this act, may be expended for the purchase of lands for schools or experimental farms, whenever authorized by the respective Legislatures of said States.

Second, No portion of said fund, nor the interest thereon, shall be applied, directly or indirectly, under any pretense whatever, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings.

Third, Any State which may take and claim the benefit of the provisions of this act shall provide, within five years, at least not less than one college, as described in the fourth section of this act, or the grant to such state shall cease; and said State shall be bound to pay the United States the amount received of any lands previously sold, and that the title to purchasers under the State shall be valid.

Fourth, An annual report shall be made regarding the progress of each college, recording any improvements and experiments made, with their cost and results, and such other matters, including State industrial and economical statistics, as may be supposed useful; one copy of which shall be transmitted by mail free, by each, to all other colleges which may be endowed under the provisions of this act, and also one copy to the Secretary of the Interior.

Fifth, When lands shall be selected from those which have been raised to double the minimum price, in consequence of railroad grants, they shall be computed to the States at the maximum price, and the number of acres proportionally diminished.

Sixth, No State while in a condition of rebellion or insurrection against the Government of the United States shall be entitled to the benefit of this act.

---

[1] Italics added by this writer.

Seventh, No State shall be entitled to the benefits of this act unless it shall express its acceptance thereof by its Legislature within two years from the date of its approval by the President.

Sec. 6. And be it further enacted, That land scrip issued under the provisions of this act shall not be subject to location until after the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three.

Sec. 7. And be it further enacted, That the land officers shall receive the same fees for locating land scrip issued under the provisions of this act as is now allowed for the location of military bounty land warrants under existing laws. Provided, Their maximum compensation shall not be thereby increased.

Sec. 8. And be it further enacted, That the Governors of the several States to which scrip shall be issued under this act shall be required to report annually to Congress all sales made of such scrip until the whole shall be disposed of, the amount received for the same, and what appropriation has been made of the proceeds.

The Hatch Act (Approved and Signed by the President March 2, 1887)[1]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture, and to promote scientific investigation and experiments respecting the principles and applications of agricultural sciences, there shall be established, under direction of the college or colleges, or agricultural department of colleges, in each State or Territory established, or which may hereafter be established, in accordance with the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, entitled "An Act donating public lands to the several states and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," or any of the supplements to said act, a department to be known and designated as an "agricultural experiment station:" Provided that in any State or Territory in which two such colleges have been or may be established the appropriation hereinafter made to such State or Territory shall be equally divided between such colleges, unless the Legislature of such State or Territory shall otherwise direct.

Sec. 2. That it shall be the object and duty of said experiment stations to conduct original researches or verify experiments on the physiology of plants and animals; the diseases to which they are severally subject, with the remedies for the same; the chemical composition of useful plants at their different stages of growth; the comparative advantages of rotative cropping as pursued under varying series of crops; the capacity of new plants or trees for acclimation; the analysis of soils and water; the chemical composition of manures, natural or arti-

---

[1] Congressional Record, 49th Congress, second session, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office), 1887, Vol. 18, p. 2282-2283.

ficial, with experiments designed to test their comparative effects on crops of different kinds; the adaptation and value of grasses and forage plants; the composition and digestibility of the different kinds of food for domestic animals; the scientific and economic questions involved in the production of butter and cheese; and such other researches or experiments bearing directly on the agricultural industry of the United States as may in each case be deemed advisable, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective states and Territories.

Sec. 3. That in order to secure, as far as practicable, uniformity of methods and results in the work of said stations, it shall be the duty of the United States Commissioner of Agriculture to furnish forms, as far as practicable, for the tabulation of results of investigation or experiments; to indicate, from time to time, such lines of inquiry as to him shall seem most important; and, in general, to furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this act. It shall be the duty of each of said stations, annually, on or before the first day of February, to make to the governor of the State or Territory in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations, including a statement of receipts and expenditures, a copy of which report shall be sent to each of said stations, to the said Commissioner of Agriculture, and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 4. That bulletins or reports of progress shall be published at said stations at least once in three months, one copy of which shall be sent to each newspaper in the States or Territories in which they are respectively located, and to such individuals actually engaged in farming as may request the same, and as far as the means of the station will permit. Such bulletins or reports and the annual reports of said stations shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge for postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may from time to time prescribe.[1]

Sec. 5. That for the purpose of paying the necessary expenses of conducting investigations and experiments, and printing and distributing the results, as hereinbefore prescribed, the sum of $15,000 per annum is hereby appropriated to each State, to be specially provided for by Congress in the appropriations from year to year, and to each Territory entitled under the provisions of section 8 of this act, out of any money in the Treasury proceeding from the sales of public lands, to be paid in equal quarterly payments, on the first day of January, April, July, and October in each year, to the treasurer or other officer duly appointed by the governing boards of said colleges to receive the same, the first payment is to be made on the first day of October, 1887: Provided, however, That out of the first annual appropriation so received by any station, an amount not exceeding one-fifth may be expended in the erection, enlargement, or repair of a building or buildings necessary for carrying on the work of such station; and thereafter

---

[1] Italics added by this writer.

an amount not exceeding 5 percent of such annual appropriation may be so expended.

Sec. 6. That whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of the Treasury, from the annual statement of receipts and expenditures of any of said stations, that a portion of the preceding annual appropriation remains unexpended, such amount shall be deducted from the next succeeding annual appropriation to such station, in order that the amount of money appropriated to any station shall not exceed the amount actually and necessarily required for its maintenance and support.

Sec. 7. That nothing in this act shall be construed to impair or modify the legal relation existing between any of the said colleges and the government of the States or Territories in which they are respectively located.

Sec. 8. That in States having colleges entitled under this section to the benefits of this act, and having also agricultural experiment stations established by law, separate from said colleges, such States shall be authorized to apply such benefits to experiments at stations so established by such States; and in case any State shall have established under the provisions of said act of July 2 aforesaid, an agricultural department or experimental station, in connection with any school, and such State shall have established, or shall hereafter establish a separate agricultural college or school, which shall have connected therewith an experimental farm or station, the Legislature of such State may apply, in whole or in part, the appropriation by this act made to such separate agricultural college or school; and no Legislature shall, by contract, express or implied, disable itself from so doing.

Sec. 9. That the grants of money authorized by this act are made subject to the legislative assent of the several States and Territories to the purposes of said grants; provided, That payment of such installments of the appropriation herein made as shall become due any State before the adjournment of the regular session of its Legislature meeting next after the passage of this act, shall be made upon the assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 10. Nothing in this act shall be held or construed as binding the United States to continue any payments from the Treasury to any or all the States or institutions mentioned in this act, but Congress may at any time amend, suspend, or repeal any or all the provisions of this act.

The Homestead Act, the Morrill Act, and the Hatch Act, all great boons to agriculture, are indicative of the land policy of the United States mentioned earlier in this paper: "get it settled so the country may advance." Getting the land distributed seemed to be more of a problem than how to distribute it. But that much of it went for research and education is a

strong argument against those who would criticize the "give-away" policy.

How much land actually was distributed for such projects was quite well summarized by James Harlan, senator from Iowa, in a speech given during debate on the Morrill Act.[1]

> The first fact, perhaps that ought to be considered by the Senators from new States is that the government has been liberal in making large grants of lands for various public purposes to the "land states;" and I doubt if any Senator has an adequate conception of the aggregate amount of lands that have been thus granted.
>
> All of the older land States are entitled to the sixteenth section of each township, which is one thirty-sixth part of the entire area of those States. Each of the newer land States--Minnesota, Kansas, California and Oregon--is entitled to both the sixteenth and thirty-sixth section, being one-eighteenth of the entire area.
>
> Each of the land States also is entitled to five hundred thousand acres of land under the Act of 1841. They are also entitled to seventy-two sections each, to aid in the organization and support of colleges. They are entitled to select twelve salt springs, with six sections of land adjacent to each, amounting in the aggregate to seventy-two sections of the public lands in each State.
>
> They also are entitled, under another act of Congress, to ten sections of land each to aid in the erection of public buildings. They are also entitled to all the land denominated (sic) swamp or overflowed lands. They have also received large grants to aid in the improvement of rivers, and to aid in the construction of canals. They are also entitled to five percent of the net proceeds of the sales of public lands within their limits, made after they enter the Union.
>
> In addition to this, all the mineral lands within the States are reserved for sale and become a common estate, or perhaps I might style them common plunder grounds. They belong to the entire inhabitants in common to use and occupy as they choose without rent or tax. In addition to this, at the present session of Congress a bill was passed termed the Homestead Bill, which enables any citizen of the United States to settle on and occupy after the payment of ten dollars and the ordinary land office fees, a quarter section of the public lands, and ultimately secure title in fee simple without additional cost.

It was during this period of government distribution of land for free or for almost nothing that the great antipathy for speculators arose in the United States. Many still insist that money made in speculation is tainted.

---

[1]James Harlan of Iowa, Congressional Globe (Washington: John C. Rives), 37th Congress, second session, Part III, p. 2328.

More important, however, was the establishment of free proprietorship in America.

Although Senator Lane of Kansas was the most vociferous opponent of the Morrill Act, others opposed it for providing an opportunity for speculators to reap unearned profits.

During debates on the bill, Mr. Wilkerson said he opposed the bill because it would put scrip calling for 9,270,000 acres of land into the hands of land speculators, "who, consulting their own interests only, will locate it upon the most valuable public lands in the West, and hold it until it is made valuable through the labors of the settlers who occupy lands adjacent to it."

> Nothing retarded the settlement of the new states, he said, so much as the pernicious system of land speculation which has prevailed in the country for the last twenty years. It has materially affected the industry as well as the morals of the nation, and has ever operated most injuriously upon the poorer classes of the West.
>
> It has affected the laboring men. What the land speculator makes upon the rise of his lands is wrung from the hard labor and incessant toil of the best, but poor settlers upon the public land.
>
> The first settlers in a Territory are those upon whom rest the heavy burdens of organizing new municipal governments and of laying the foundations of the State. And, sir, without this population there will be no advancement, no prosperity worth mentioning.[1]

The feeling against speculators of the time was manifested in the preemption law giving settlers exclusive first settler privileges. They could settle the best lands beyond government surveys and be assured of keeping it. This law came to give Americans free proprietorship without historical precedent.

While it is not pointed out in Congress, the earlier settlers and farmers of any given community still today are benefitting from the settle-

---

[1] Wilkerson, op. cit., p. 2395.

settlement of adjacent lands. Through the history of agriculture in the United States it is apparent that many farmers did not make money from farming or management but from the increase in the value of the land they had title to.

Although the frontier is said to be past now, it is a wise speculator today who can buy land adjacent to a town or city he feels will grow toward him. Buying acres and selling lots has meant financial security, early retirement and a large estate for many modern land speculators.

Although there have been peaks (during and immediately following wars) and valleys (during depressions), prices of land have gone steadily upward since the $1.25 an acre of the Homestead Act days to the $200 an acre today.

With the national policy so obviously based on getting settlers and getting the land into private hands, it was fortunate so much of it went for educational and investigative purposes. Tying the Morrill Act to the Civil War gave us compulsory military training in all land-grant colleges: another war expediency that has proved beneficial. For the United States since then has not lived through a generation that did not need military leaders.

Land-grant colleges, through their reserved officers training corps, furnished more officers for the armed forces during World War II than either of the national military training academies.

As has so often been the case, a war brought about changes that materially affect civilian industry and economy following the war.

President James Buchanan had vetoed a law similar to the Morrill Act two years before Abraham Lincoln signed the law under which agricultural education has made great strides. War was not threatening Buchanan's administration.

During debate on establishing land-grant colleges, Senator Lane of

Kansas was the most bitter antagonist of the act. Most of the amendments to the act as it was first introduced were inspired by or added by the Kansas senator. Kansas had more government land in its borders than did other states, he argued. Therefore other states would choose their land from the best that recently had been added to the Union in Kansas. He was afraid New York, entitled to nearly one million of the more than nine million acres provided for, might choose most of Kansas' best acres. He also argued the same for Florida and other states then at war with the North.

It was Lane who got the amendment limiting total acres taken within the borders of one state to one million. Otherwise, he said, Missouri would choose all their land in Kansas.

Although it is little known today, state universities also are land-grant institutions. (Military training, however, is not compulsory at them) Congress previously had provided seventy-two sections (46,080 acres) to each state for the establishment of a university.

It is seen that as early as the 1860's other phases of the economy and social life of the United States were closely related to agriculture--and did not progress independently of agriculture. Now, with most of the population non-agricultural, agricultural economy and social life cannot progress independently of other segments of the United States.

A speech by the Hon. P. T. Glass of Tennessee in the House of Representatives in 1887 indicates the dominance of agriculture in early American history:

> Washington, the farmer president, in his fourth (sic) annual message to Congress, recommended legislation to aid and encourage agriculture; the committee having the matter in charge reported a bill for creating a national board of agriculture to be composed of judges of the Supreme Court, members of the cabinet and the national Congress.[1]

---

[1] Italics added by this writer.

The apparent ludicrousness of creating a national board of agriculture to be composed of these officials will, in a measure, be dispelled when we reflect that in that time cultivators of the soil were frequently to be found among the counselors and lawmakers of the nation.

The bill did not, however, become a law, and it does not appear that any further attempt to aid agriculture by national legislation was made until 1839, when Congress made an appropriation of $500 (sic) to be expended by the commissioner of patents in collecting agricultural statistics.

> Jefferson, the true friend of agriculture, declared that his confidence in the perpetuity of republican institutions in this country was based upon the fact that agriculture was to be the chief occupation of the people.[1]

Although the agricultural population of the United States now is considerably less than 20 percent and still declining, agriculture still is of primary importance because it furnishes the raw materials on which so much of our industry depends.

Economists--government, professional, industrial, and even agricultural--agree that the idea that all economy followed agriculture is and was false. However, only recently James Rorty pointed out that the United States will remain a great industrial nation only so long as it also remains a great agricultural nation.[2]

Rorty's great concern was to stop depletion of the United States farm acres. To make his argument important he showed the role of farm products in the nation's industrial economy.

He bemoaned non-passage of the National Soil Fertility bill to provide vast quantities of much needed potash and phosphate by expanding the Tennessee Valley Authority's experimental fertilizer program.

---

[1] P. T. Glass, Congressional Record (Washington: United States Government Printing Office), 1887, 49th Congress, Second Session, Vol. 18, Part 3, p. 76.

[2] James Rorty, "Power to Feed," Commonweal, Oct. 10, 1947, p. 615-617.

Although backed by the powerful American Farm Bureau Federation, the fertilizer program failed to pass because of the powerful two-headed lobby of the American Plant Food Council and the National Fertilizer association, Rorty said. To prove his point, he pointed to the $36,000 annual salary ex-Congressman Woodrum as head of the fertilizer lobby.

With nearly all regulations on agriculture coming from Washington now, there is much politics in the programs. A farm editor needs to know a lot about politics, history, law and economics to make the political theories intelligible to the public.

He should know and interpret to his readers, for example, that the controversial Brannan plan was an attempt to reconcile interests of two powerful blocs that elected Harry S. Truman president: farmers and city workers. The Brannan plan undertook, regardless of how illogical it seemed, to raise prices for farmers and lower prices for the city consumers of the farmers' produce. The simple device of the subsidy paid to farmers by all taxpayers would have made the trick possible.

This highly dramatic struggle was one affecting every taxpayer, every producer and every consumer of food--in a word everyone in the United States (and indirectly millions overseas). Because it was a struggle between the administration and the largest (and undoubtedly the strongest) farm organization in the United States: the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Brannan had sprung his plan without consulting Farm Bureau leaders. In return the Farm Bureau had conducted its national convention and, for the first time in modern history, did not invite the secretary of agriculture.

The Democratic National committee held a farmer-labor rally at Des Moines to explain the plan. This was to be a kick-off meeting with others held throughout the nation. Further Democratic strategy was to put Repre-

sentative Stephen Pace, Democrat from Georgia, in charge of the bill on the House floor. This was to keep the southern Democrats in line and secure passage.

But they had not reckoned with an ambitious young member of the House from rural Tennessee, Albert Gore. Gore moved to extend the law then in force for another year. Seventy-six Southern Democrats stampeded to the Gore motion. They, with 160 Republicans, blocked Brannan.

Gore, who hoped to be a Senator, followed instructions of Farm Bureau leaders of Tennessee. That is why the Brannan plan lost.[1] Despite the fact that the Brannan plan had more written about it and more writers interpreting it, few understood all its ramifications.

Actually there was nothing new about the Brannan plan except frankness. It just said agriculture has been subsidized, is subsidized and must be subsidized.[2] Farmers apparently preferred to get the subsidy in higher prices through supports. The Brannan plan would have provided the subsidy in checks.

To begin with, Brannan's plan regulations would have tapered subsidies until the largest farmers got none. It would have helped the small farmer most so it had Farmers Union backing. But, when it became obvious that he could not get this part of the bill, the regulations favoring the small operator were eliminated.

Those who have followed farm news remember that the split between Farm Bureau and the United States Department of Agriculture had no historical backing. For 30 years they had worked together. Federal and state funds en-

[1]"Why the Farm Plan Lost," New Republic, p. 6-7, August 1, 1949.

[2]Dale Kramer, Survey, "What the Farm Shooting Is All About," p. 126, March, 1950.

couraged farm bureaus and county agents did much of their organizing.

The marriage even weathered the storm brought on by the late Senator George Norris and his investigating committee which showed national leadership of the Farm Bureau had fallen into hands of men who sold their members' influence to fertilizer manufacturers, the ship subsidy interests and chain stores. Norris' investigating committee showed that the Farm Bureau thus helped block the government operation of Muscle Shoals as a power plant.[1]

The Farm Bureau not only weathered that storm, but it grew. Edward Asbury O'Neal III, national president of the Farm Bureau from 1931 to 1947, more than any other man, shaped United States farm policy.[2] In his heydey he is said to have no peer as a Washington lobbyist.

Throughout American agricultural history there have been strong agricultural organizations or political parties. A proper interpretation of politics and legislation depends in no small measure on the study of these groups.

There have been those that sought to promote some special industry, like farmers' elevator companies, the meat producer associations, the wool growers' association, cooperative creamery and oil associations, the wheat, beef and even honey bee groups.

Then there were those that tried to unite the farmers as a class, like the Grange and the Farmers' Alliance. Others, like the American Farm Bureau and the Greenback and Populist parties were principally western and agricultural in origin.

The Greenback and Populist parties became rallying points for the more discontented and radical farmers who wanted to revolt against major parties.

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Time Magazine, p. 14, Dec. 29, 1947.

Their revolting parties were organized to appeal to the farmer and the laboring man.

Grangers, the Non-Partisan League and the Farm Bureau on the other hand, have tried to nominate candidates in the major parties and obtain pledges for agrarian reforms. This combination (or philosophy) was in no small degree responsible for such bills as the Hatch Act, the Interstate Commerce Act, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, the Federal Reserve Act and more recent agricultural legislation enacted largely through the influence of the American Farm Bureau Federation.[1]

Because of their influence on legislation so vitally affecting farmers, consumers and others of America, knowledge of the current farm organizations is necessary for the successful farm reporter.

The American Farm Bureau Federation

Currently the Farm Bureau is the strongest lobby on farm legislation because of its advantages in organization and its appeal to the larger, more successful, more efficient and, consequently, more influential farmers. Allan Kline, rumored to have been favored by Thomas Dewey for secretary of agriculture, is president. He raises hogs and hybrid corn on his Vinton, Iowa, farm; has a town home in Des Moines; sits on the board of Chicago's Federal Reserve Bank. He studies economics, philosophy and history; gets $15,000 a year as Farm Bureau head. Farm Bureau claims nearly 1,500,000 dues-paying members, recently has gone into the insurance and other businesses heavily.[2]

In 1914, when the act of that year established cooperative agricultural

---

[1] Schmidt and Ross, op. cit., p. 20.

[2] Time, op. cit.

work between the United States Department of Agriculture and state agricultural colleges, half the funds for the work were to come from the states.

State legislatures made outright grants to Farm Bureaus or grants to established Farm Bureaus. Several, like Kansas, granted money only to those with a certain number or percentage of county farmers as members. This made the county agricultural agent a Farm Bureau organizer.

Since then the Federal administration has leaned heavily on local Farm Bureaus to carry on various programs of the United States Department of Agriculture.

The wedding has been a lasting one; it had been a harmonious one, for the most part, until the Brannan Plan and its aftermath has both thinking of divorce.

Understanding its strength and its effect on their personal lives, every newspaper reader needs to know what the Farm Bureau is for, against.

It favors parity payments to farmers (as defined by the Farm Bureau), credit at low interest rates for farmers, payments for conservation.

It is against the Good Neighbor Policy: "No useful purpose would be served by bringing commodities to the United States which already are in surplus in this country."[1]

It opposes social security for farm workers: "The federation opposed extension of old-age benefits to farm workers until such time as agricultural prices are restored to parity levels."[2]

Reciprocal-trade agreements: "The Farm Bureau stood against any reciprocal-trade agreements which might force or hold domestic prices for any

---

[1]Wesley McCune, The Farm Bloc (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran and Company), 1943, p. 171.

[2]Ibid., p. 173.

farm commodity below parity level."[1]

Labor: The Bureau has always supported organized labor. However, they deplore the use of violence, boycotts, lockouts, other irresponsible acts.[2]

Farm Security Administration: The Farm Bureau is very definitely opposed to the radical leaders of the Farm Security Administration who have joined with the radical labor leaders of the nation to sell agriculture down the river in order to gain their own selfish, bureaucratic aims.[3]

Such magazines as Time, if they do not favor entirely the same things as the Farm Bureau, at least oppose some of the same things. Time reported parts of President Allan B. Kline's talk in Chicago's Stevens hotel:[4]

"The people who are supporting this plan (Brannan) are either very dumb or they're dishonest." Time does not say it agrees, but there is the matter of selection of quotes for the reader.

"The whole plan would work out to the disadvantage of the efficient farmer."

"Government payments are not a desirable substitute for price supports. The ultimate effect would be nationalization of agriculture. There is no good reason why the government should pay part of the grocery bill of every citizen."

A year earlier Time had pointed out, reporting on the Farm Bureau's reaction to the Hope-Aiken Act (under which the government was free to lower price supports from 90 per cent to 60 percent of parity after 1950) that

---

[1] Ibid., p. 170.

[2] Ibid., p. 174.

[3] Ibid., p. 176.

[4] "Rustle in the Grass Roots," Time December 26, 1949, p. 10.

"Kline and Midwest farmers thought the Hope-Aiken Act just right."[1]

"No one suggested farmers prove they were free enterprisers they fancied themselves by eventually doing away with all price supports, any more than businessmen would do away with tariffs."[2]

At the same time, such magazines as New Republic have criticized the Farm Bureau stand.

"The Farm Bureau, though it has enrolled many small farmers in some states, is the voice and apparatus of the very biggest factory-farm operators of the country."[3]

"Every reason that the Farm Bureau has for opposing the Brannan Plan is a reason for the National Farmers Union to support it--which it has done vigorously since the plan was announced.

"National Farmers Union is the organization of family farmers who own and operate the acres on which they live."[4]

"They believe in principles of soil conservation, regional development, coalition of interest of working farmer and working people of the cities, are committed irrevocably to the proposition that the family farmers shall receive an income on par with that gained by any other group of workers in the nation."

Another issue of the New Republic quoted, "...reactionary resolutions (adopted at Atlantic City) in the name of rank and file were promulgated by a self-perpetuating national executive in whose selection the membership has

---

[1]"Agriculture--How High?" Time, Dec. 27, 1948, p. 51.

[2]Loc. cit.

[3]Mezerik, A. G., "The Brannan Plan," New Republic, Nov. 28, 1949, p.11.

[4]Loc. cit.; italics added by this writer to bring out editorial bias.

no voice."[1]

"In many localities the AAA (PMA) regional committees are filled by Farm Bureau members. The first step in obtaining federal aid in these districts is to become a Farm Bureau member ... substantially the same goes for loan crops (sic), the FSA and migratory workers service."[2]

It appears that the best way to understand the program of the Farm Bureau or of any other farm organizations is to get on mailing lists and study the source material they send. If one is to learn from magazines, it is obvious from the above quotations that he should read at least one "left" and one "right" magazine. That is a recommended practice by the writer for agricultural news reporters, editors, interpreters.

Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union or National Farmers Union

The Farmers Union has 500,000 dues-paying members. James Patton is national president. Headquarters are in Denver.

National Farmers Union was organized by Isaac Newton Gresham of Point, Texas, in 1902. Politically it is the most "left" of the farm organizations; has had many close tie-ins with labor organizations. Fifteen years ago it had twice as many members as it now has. Union leaders were organizers, in several states, of the Farm Holiday Association, pledged to strike against starvation prices by keeping their products off the market. Holidayers upset milk trucks making deliveries and otherwise took economic ills into their own hands.[3]

---

[1] Bernard Raymund, Safety Harbor, Fla., "Correspondence," New Republic March 28, 1949, p. 31.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] McCune, op. cit., p. 202.

Union history records that Edward E. Kennedy, elected secretary in 1931, took sides with Father Charles Coughlin, Detroit radio priest. Both Kennedy and Coughlin supported William Lemke of North Dakota for president on the new Union ticket in 1936.

In 1942 Union leaders helped win a victory and a new lease on life for the Farm Security Administration.[1]

The Union fought with the present national administration against the Farm Bureau for price control.

The Union is for: production for abundance, maintenance of family-type farming in America, parity for agriculture, "parity of sacrifice," a sound tax program to close loopholes and based upon ability to pay with top limit on net incomes of $25,000 a year.

The Union believes "farm workers (Mexicans) are people and that they, no less than members of working farm families, are entitled to 'toilets, baths, cold water, and perhaps even to hot water and all that red-tape stuff.'"[2]

Preface to the original constitution and by-laws of the Farmers Union still is cited and contains, "But today less than ten percent of our population owns ninety percent of the nation's wealth."

Six basic aims adopted at the national convention of the Union in 1940 include:

Soil Conservation payments made only on basis of needs, not as a means of supporting commodity-income programs...a reduction in the maximum size of benefit payments, with increases in small payments; bringing dairy products under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration; removal of interstate

---

[1] Ibid., p. 204.

[2] McCune, op. cit., p. 211.

trade barriers; federal aid for rural health and low cost rural housing.

It also struck against payment of poll taxes as a condition for voting in seven southern states (other farm organizations are on the other side of this question).

As it previously had indicated, the Union felt "The need for organized labor and organized agriculture to cooperate of the greatest importance."[1]

The Farmers Union, with by-laws urging 5 percent of net income be spent on "education," likes to point out such information as "five-sixths of America's rural homes still have no modern plumbing.

"Seventy-five percent of all American farm wives carry their own water supply.

"One-half million farm homes have no privies at all.

"One-third of our farmers get less than $300 a year."[2]

The author has not been able to check the accuracy of these statements, but strongly feels that another case could have been made from the same statistics. Very likely they come from that list of part-time "farmers" who own two or three acres and could not be expected to earn a livelihood from farming. If true, they show a great social need, but probably should be recognized as a social problem rather than a farm problem. It is a condition that should not exist in a land known for its great production and high standard of living. If those in charge of the national census would redefine the word "farm," it would show the problem to be social more than a farm problem.

Calling many persons farmers, so designated by the census, is like in-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 214.

[2] Wallace, Henry, "Report on the Farmers," New Republic, June 30, 1947, p. 2.

cluding childrens' roadside pop stands among the nation's businesses. Farm editors can serve society by finding a way to improve the lot of the person called a farmer who actually has only a very few unproductive acres.

This writer does not believe it could best be done with a sliding scale of farm subsidies with greatest percentage payments to those doing the least. That would put too much of a premium on inefficiency. History does not indicate that America or any other country has grown strong, or great, or solved its economic troubles that way.

Perhaps this attack on inefficiency indicated a bias against the Farmers Union. It was not meant to do so and is not true. This writer feels that the Farmers Union, with its educational program, is a service American agriculture could ill afford to be without.

The Farm Bureau, currently in the saddle politically, needs an organization "to view with alarm" the same as the Democratic party needs the Republicans--or vice versa--to "view with alarm."

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives or the National Co-op Council

The Co-Op Council includes the Grange, Farm Bureau, Milk Producers' Federation (its largest division), Dairymen's League Cooperative association, the Grange League Federation Exchange, California Fruit Growers Exchange, the California Walnut Growers Association, and many, many others--but NOT the Farmers Union.

It has about 4,500 separate organizations in 48 states. Their members and customers total more than two million with more than $1,250,000,000.00 annual business. That is BIG business.

They buy or sell cooperatively nearly everything that touches the

kitchen table and many that do not: cranberries, turkeys, calavos, cotton, milk, apples, rice, grain, cattle, wool, potatoes, mushrooms, all kinds of nuts, eggs, raisins, tobacco, seed, gasoline, tools, fertilizers, feeds, and others.[1]

H. E. Babcock, recent president and long-time leader of the cooperatives, said in the 1942 Blue Book:

> The political power of cooperatives in the United States is potentially enormous. Not even the two great trade union groups can match the membership, the capital, the skilled manpower, and the control of the media of communication which already are in the hands of the assembled farmer cooperatives in the United States. Fortunately, however, the political power of cooperatives is a sleeping giant which has never been aroused. I pray God it never shall be.[2]

Order of the Patrons of Husbandry or the National Grange

The Grange, organized in 1866 by O. H. Kelley, is the oldest farm organization. Kelley, a clerk in the United States Department of Agriculture, was sent to the South to look into the rural aftermath of the Civil War. He was a Mason, decided farmers needed a secret organization like the Masons. His niece added that it should be open to women to participate equally with their husbands.[3]

The Grange officers are similar to those of a fraternity: master, overseer, lecturer, steward, chaplain, treasurer, secretary, gate keeper, lady assistant steward and women ritualistic officers: Ceres (grain), Pomona (fruit), and Flora (flower).

None of the six original charter members of the Grange were farming when the Grange was organized. Five of them were with the United States govern-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 123.

[2] Italics added.

[3] McCune, op. cit., p. 145.

ment in Washington, D. C. There were two U.S.D.A. clerks, two treasury department officials, a superintendent of the U.S.D.A. garden and grounds, a clerk in the finance division of the post office, and a vineyardist of New York state.[1]

Without assets, other than a fraternal blessing, Kelley started northwest to organize the Grange.

The Grange grew in membership and influence until many writers credited it with regulating railroads and other private utilities, for getting rural free delivery of mail, the parcel post system, vocational agriculture in schools and other farm benefits.[2]

Inaccurate farm newspaper reporters made the Grange bear the odium of other more radical farm organizations. Newsmen called any group of farmers advocating any legislation "Grangers." It almost ruined their organization and changed the meaning of the word "grange."

Actually the Grange was not a political organization and politics was forbidden in its chapters.[3]

Adopted in 1874, this is still its official statement on politics:

> We shall endeavor ... to enhance the comforts and attractions of our homes...to foster cooperation...to diversify crops...we propose meeting together, buying together, selling together...we wage no aggressive warfare against any other interests whatever...we hold that transportation companies are necessary to our success, that their interests are intimately connected with our interests, and that harmonious action is mutually advantageous. We are not enemies of the railroads...No Grange, if true to its obligations, can discuss political conventions, nor nominate candidates, nor even discuss their merits in

---

[1]With such an organizing group five-sixths government employees, one would not have guessed the Farm Bureau later would be the administration's farm darling.

[2]McCune, op. cit., p. 152.

[3]Thomas N. Carver, Selected Readings in Rural Economics (Washington: Ginn and Company), reporting seventh annual meeting of Grange in St. Louis in 1874, p. 649.

its meetings.[1]

The writer is going to extra precautions here because so many agricultural history writers and others have blamed or credited many legislative acts to the Grange. Perhaps newspaper and magazine accounts used in their studies are basically the reason for the error. Newspaper men, as previously pointed out, called any rural group boosting anything or advocating the overthrow of anything legislatively "Grangers."

In 1875 a resolution from a Texas Grange mission favoring railroad legislation was suppressed.

In 1873 the master of the Minnesota State Grange, being informed that certain Granges in his jurisdiction had appointed delegates to a state anti-railroad convention, ordered the offending Granges to recall their delegates. Congressman D. W. Aiken of South Carolina, long a member of the National Grange executive committee, said in an address in 1912:

> Frequently had the Grange to bear the odium of other men's sins... For instance, there existed in Illinois and Wisconsin, and other sections of the Northwest, agricultural clubs whose province seemed to be to wage war against transportation companies. Anathemas were hurled upon the Grange for making this attack, whereas every Patron of Husbandry knew that the Grange as such was not a participant in the fight from the beginning to the end.[2]

The real organ of agitation against transportation companies at the time was state Farmers' Associations and their subordinate lodges called "Farmers' clubs."

Going into business on an over-expanded scale was the downfall of the Granges, or at least one of the greatest contributing factors, according to Carver.

In 1885 the patrons were said to own five steamboat or packet lines,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 651.

[2] Ibid., p. 253.

thirty-two grain elevators, and twenty-two warehouses. Some were local but the full treasuries of the state Granges furnished the capital.[1]

Experimenting with other people's money made it easy, if not tempting, to get into trouble.

District Granges disbanded for fear of being held individually liable for state Grange debts, and the Grange was greatly weakened. Another weakening factor was the quarrel over jurisdiction between the Grange of Canada and that of the United States. Some state Granges disbanded alleging pecuniary reasons and the autocratic rule of the National Grange.

The Farm Bureau, though protected with much more stringent federal and state regulations for its members' protection, might well spend time studying a history of the Patrons of Husbandry.

Lobbyists

Since so much of this paper thus far has dealt with pressure groups, lobbies, segments of society, perhaps a word in defense of lobbies is in order. It is well known that lobbying stems from a fundamental right we have been trained to go to war to preserve: the right of petition.

It also is well known that legislation affecting the income of millions of businesses, trade organizations, labor unions, farmers, professional societies and others makes lobbying a multi-million-dollar enterprise.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, lobbyists were required to register and report expenses and compensations.

Lobbyists for the various farm organizations spend about $150,000 annually; business and trade lobbyists, about $3,000,000.

But some of the simplest and most effective lobbies are built around

---

[1] Carver, op. cit., p. 662.

the friendship and respect naturally accorded a respectable man who represents a responsible organization in an open and above-board manner.[1] One who lays his cards on the table before the legislator and is in a position to commit his organization to performance on which they will deliver. Some of the farm organizations and brotherhoods are noted for this technique.

Of more than 1,000 registered lobbyists (more than the number of Senators and Representatives combined) registered with their more than $4,000,000 a year expenses and compensations, some are contrary to the public interest.

LaFollette, writing in defense of lobbyists said, "Some lobbying is useless; some wasteful. By and large, however, lobbying reflects the complexity of our society and government. The bulk of it represents viewpoints and interests which should be and are considered in the legislative process."

From the number of persons who are admittedly lobbyists and from their compensations and expenses, it is obvious that as a part of our legislative process, the American public should be informed of lobbyists' actions.

Yet only one reporting service, The Congressional Quarterly, has systematically publicized the meager facts obtainable from records required under the Lobby Registration Act, part of the reorganization bill of 1946.

Helen Fuller said last year that lobbyists have been allowed to flourish in comparative privacy ever since Hugo Black's Senate lobby investigating committee closed its doors in 1936.[2]

Farmers, like nearly all citizens, need to have the legislative processes re-explained to them. They had it in grade school, again in high school, and many of them, the third time in college, but they still need to

---

[1] Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., "Some Lobbies Are Good," Times Magazine New York, May 16, 1948, p. 15, 54.

[2] Helen Fuller, "Let's Look at the Lobbies," New Republic January 3, 1949, p. 17.

be backgrounded or reminded: How a few men can prevent a bill from being voted on in Congress; how bills are introduced, pushed, pigeon-holed, debated, passed, signed by the President and become law.

If it's a farm bill, farmers should be intensely interested in the men whipping the law through the legislature or those obstructing it.

Farmers and their urban cousins probably would read features on the principal characters in the Washington drama that decide the fate of the farmer and the interdependent consumer of farm products.

Congressmen can, and often do, kill bills in committee without taking the rap (or getting the credit) for it. Time, News Week, the New York Times and a few other dailies report most of the action, but it never gets to the general public.

The Associated Press, United Press, International News Service and other services generally furnish stories requested. A few alert farm editors probably could (and should) make enough requests so more than one of the wire services would have a farm editor on the Washington scene.

More and more, farm news touching the six million United States agricultural producers is emanating from Washington. Yet only one wire service has a farm editor in the nation's capital. Political reporters, covering the farm debates, go into great detail on how the Republicans or Democrats fared on each debate, vote, maneuver. But few report what the battle meant to the farmer or the homemaker at the neighborhood market.

Farm editors with a rather thorough knowledge of politics, economics, and agriculture can ask Washington services for this penetrating information. The Washington correspondent knows the intricacies of our legislative process so well he assumes his readers know it all too. More analysis, backgrounding, and interpretation is needed on political news. And as already

mentioned, the political writers explain nearly all Washington happenings in terms of politics. The Brannan plan is a good example. Nearly everyone understood the politics of the plan, for it was widely reported. Few city or rural readers had any knowledge of how it might work, who it might favor, why (other than political) it had been proposed, or what the common dirt farmer or livestockman felt about it.

Because other sections of most newspapers do such a poor job of reporting (with a few major exceptions) and backgrounding on political candidates, farm reporters can perform a real service by giving readers the record on all agricultural voting of all major candidates, their backgrounds, who is supporting them, their public statements, their answers to questions sent them by the farm editor.

The Political Action Committee of the Congress of Industrial Organization made great use of pamphlets during the last three national elections. The pamphlets, many believe, were successful because they reported records of candidates. Newspapers could have killed the effectiveness of the pamphlets had they been doing their job well.

If the farm editor will do a good job on Congressmen, they will become as well known to the farmers and homemakers of the newspaper's territory as the county agricultural or home demonstration agent. The farm editor, likewise, will become well known and influential--probably so well known that he will be offered side-line political writing jobs during campaigns. Pay probably will be tempting, but integrity, like virginity, has no selling price.

After reading several pro and con views on the "farm bloc" and the same for lobbyists, the writer wondered about some of the conclusions, particularly on the "farm bloc."

It was presumptious of him, but he wanted to find recorded votes on farm

legislation to see how effective farm blocs, lobbyists, and others were in influencing farm legislation.

It was a tedious, involved process to find the recorded votes, move them to study paper, then find first names, party affiliations and home states for the Congressmen. But it was interesting to see different forces at work on the roll call votes.

He became quite thoroughly convinced that each recorded vote is a bid for re-election--almost without exception. He also was interested in the "politicians"[1] who took "general pairs" with other "politicians" on controversial legislation. As the reader knows, no one can tell how the Congressman answering with "general pairs" stand on an issue. Those who answer with "pairs"[2] tell how they would vote were they voting, but they do not vote.

But the analysis will following the recorded votes in both the House of Representatives and the Senate which follow:

Explanation of votes in the U. S. House of Representatives, on succeeding pages:

A - An amendment to provide $250,000,000 for parity payments on wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. Yeas 191; Nays 204.[3]

B - To amend Agricultural Act of 1938, suspend rules and pass. Yeas 167; Nays 107; two-thirds not voting in favor; rules were not suspended; bill did not pass.[4]

---

[1] As opposed to "statesmen."

[2] Pairs have at least one for and one against the proposed legislation; however, they frequently contain two for and one against, or vice-versa. Neither "general pairs" or "pairs" vote. They go on record as "not voting."

[3] House Journal, 76th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1939, p. 401.

[4] House Journal, 76th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1940, p. 1057.

C - Vote for passage of the Federal Crop Insurance Act. Yeas 256; Nays 100; Present 1.[1]

D - To pass over F. D. Roosevelt's veto HR 2869 to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation with many restrictions and permitting farm products to break Price Stabilization Act, Roosevelt argued. Yeas 228; Nays 154; Two-thirds not voting in favor; bill did not pass.[2]

E - To pass HR 3477 over President Roosevelt's veto to extend Commodity Credit Corporation to June 30, 1945. Yeas 226; Nays 151; not two-thirds.[3]

F - For passage of joint resolution to defer agricultural workers over President Truman's veto. Yeas 186; Nays 177; not two-thirds.[4]

G - Bill to provide surplus agricultural products and other nutritional foods in non-profit school lunch program. Yeas 276; Nays 103; Present 3.[5]

H - To increase the appropriation for Rural Electrical Association from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000 as recommended by budget. Yeas 196; Nays 206; Not voting 28.[6]

I - Amendment to Agricultural Act of 1949 providing 90 percent parity with production goals and marketing regulations. Yeas 239; Nays 170; Not voting 23.[7]

---

[1] House Journal, 77th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1941, p. 417.

[2] House Journal, 78th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1943, p. 533.

[3] Congressional Record, 78th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1945, p. 1874.

[4] House Journal, 79th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1945, p. 309.

[5] House Journal, 79th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1946, p. 356.

[6] Congressional Record, 80th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1947, p. 9302-3.

[7] Congressional Record, 81st Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1949, p. 9962-3.

Explanation of votes cast in the U. S. Senate, on succeeding pages:

A - Amendment to the National Defense Act to prohibit procurement of agricultural products outside the United States. Yeas 36; Nays 47.[1]

B - Amendment to permit farmers to feed excess wheat without penalty. Yeas 34; Nays 23.[2]

C - Bill to defer agricultural workers from military training under the Selective Service Act. Yeas 32; Nays 49; Not voting 15.[3]

D - Amendment to prohibit any decrease in tariff on any agricultural product being imported. Nays 49; Yeas 27.[4]

E - Bill permitting distribution of surplus farm products and other foods in a school free lunch program. (Since vote on the bill was not recorded, this is the recorded vote on Taft's amendment to cut appropriation for it from $100,000,000 to $57,500,000 with yea and nay votes reversed. Not accurate but an indication of those who favored the lunch program). Yeas 21; Nays 50.[5]

F - Amendment to include cost of farm labor in computing parity. Yeas 46; Nays 38.[6]

---

[1] Senate Journal, 77th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1941, p. 100.

[2] Congressional Record, 77th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1941, p. 6394.

[3] Congressional Record, 78th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1943, p. 1842.

[4] Senate Journal, 79th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1945, p. 265.

[5] Senate Journal, 79th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1946, p. 87.

[6] Senate Journal, 79th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1946, p. 140.

G - Senate insisting on $75,000,000 rather than $45,000,000 appropriation for school lunches and permit states to use money paid by pupils as matching funds. Yeas 81; Nays 0.[1]

H - Bill to extend tax provided in Sugar Act of 1948 and features of Sugar Act of 1937 to protect American Sugar Industry. Yeas 43; Nays 31.[2]

I - Vote on agreement to conference report amending the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to provide for federal acquisition of storage for farm commodities. Yeas 33; Nays 47.[3]

J - Amendment to make 90 percent parity prices mandatory on farm products supported by parity prices. Yeas 37; Nays 37; Not voting 22. The Vice-President Yea, so the amendment was agreed to.[4]

Since votes are recorded only by surnames under "yea" and "nay," it was necessary to use Congressional Directories to obtain given names, party affiliations and home states of the Congressmen. To get this information, these Directories were used:

1. Congressional Directory, 76th Congress, 1st Sess., Jan., p. 145-154.
2. Congressional Directory, 76th Congress, 1st Sess., May, p. 145-154.
3. Congressional Directory, 77th Congress, 1st Sess., Jan., p. 145-154.
4. Congressional Directory, 77th Congress, 1st Sess., May, p. 145-154.
5. Congressional Directory, 78th Congress, 1st Sess., June, p. 145-154.
6. Congressional Directory, 78th Congress, 2nd Sess., Jan., p. 145-154.
7. Congressional Directory, 79th Congress, 1st Sess., Feb., p. 147-156.
8. Congressional Directory, 79th Congress, 1st Sess., Aug., p. 147-156.
9. Congressional Directory, 79th Congress, 2nd Sess., Jan., p. 147-156.
10. Congressional Directory, 79th Congress, 2nd Sess., July, p. 147-156.
11. Congressional Directory, 80th Congress, 1st Sess., Feb., p. 157-166.
12. Congressional Directory, 80th Congress, 1st Sess., June, p. 157-166.
13. Congressional Directory, 81st Congress, 1st Sess., June, p. 157-166.

---

[1]Congressional Record, 80th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1947, p. 9513.

[2]Senate Journal, 80th Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1948, p. 170-1.

[3]Senate Journal, 81st Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1949, p. 376.

[4]Congressional Record, 31st Congress (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1949, p. 13773-4.

VOTES CAST IN UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON SELECTED AGRICULTURAL ACTS

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Abbitt, Watkins, Va					y	y	n	n	y	y
R	Adams, Sherman, N. H.						y				
D	Addonizio, Hugh, N. J.										n
D	Albert, Carl, Okla									y	n
R	Alexander, John G., Minn	n	y								
R	Allen, John, Cal									n	y
R	Allen, Leo, Ill	y		y	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Allen, Leonard, La	y	y	y	n	y	n	n	y	y
D	Allen, Robert, Pa	n	y							
D	Almond, J. Lindsay, Va							n	y	
R	Andersen, Carl, Minn	y	n		y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Anderson, John, Cal	n			y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Anderson, Arthur, Mo	y	y							
D	Anderson, Clinton, N. M.				n	n	n			
R	Andresen, August, Minn	n	n		y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Andrews, George, Ala						y	n	y	y
R	Andrews, Walter, N. Y.	n		y			y	n	n	
R	Angell, Homer, Ore	n	y	n	y	n	n	y	n	y
R	Arends, Leslie, Ill	y	n	n	y	y	y	n	n	y
D	Arnold, Laurence, Ill	y		y						
R	Arnold, Wat, Mo				y	y	y	y	n	
D	Ashbrook, William, Ohio									n
D	Asdinall, Wayne, Colo									y
R	Auchincloss, James, N. J.				y	y	y	y	n	

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Austin, Albert, Conn	n	y							
R	Bakewell, Claude, Mo								n	
D	Baldwin, H. Streett, Md				y	y	n			
R	Baldwin, Joseph, N. Y.			n	y	n	y			
D	Bailey, Cleveland, W. Va									n
R	Ball, Joseph, Minn	n	y							
D	Bankhead, John H., II, Ala	y								
R	Banta, Parke, Mo								n	
D	Barden, Graham, N. C.	y	y	y		y		y	y	y
D	Baring, Walter, Nev									n
D	Barnes, James, Ill	y		y						
D	Barrett, William, Pa						n	y		n
R	Barrett, Frank, Wyo				y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Barry, William, N. Y.	n	y	y		n		y		
R	Barton, Bruce, N. Y.	n								
D	Bates, Joe, Ky								y	
R	Bates, George, Mass	y	y	y	n	n		n	n	y
D	Battle, Laurie, Ala								y	y
R	Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio			n						
D	Beall, J. Glenn, Md			y					n	
D	Beckworth, Lindley, Tex	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Beiter, Alfred, N. Y.			y						
D	Bell, Jasper, Mo	y		y	y		n	n	o	
R	Bennett, Philip, Mo			y						
D	Bentson, Loyd, Tex									n
R	Bender, George, Ohio	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Bennett, Marion, Mo				y	y	y	y	n	
R	Bennett, Augustus, N. Y.						y	y		
R	Bennett, John, Mich				y	y			y	y
D	Biemiller, Andrew, Wis						n	y		n
R	Bishop, C. W. Runt, Ill			n	y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Blackney, William, Mich		n	n	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Bland, Schuyler, Va	y	y		n	n	n	n	o	y
D	Blatnik, John, Minn								y	n
D	Bloom, Sol, N. Y.	n	y	y	n	n		y	y	
D	Boehne, John, Ind	n	y	n						
R	Boggs, J. Caleb, Del								n	y
D	Boggs, Hale, La			y					y	n
D	Boland, Patrick, Pa			y						
R	Bolles, Stephen, Wis	n	n							
D	Bolling, Richard, Mo									n
R	Bolton, Chester, Ohio	n	n	n	y	y	y		n	y
D	Bonner, Herbert, N. C.			y	n	n		y	y	y
D	Boren, Lyle, Okla	y		y	y	y	n	y		
D	Bosone, Reva, Utah									n
D	Boykin, Frank, Ala	y	y		y		y	n	y	y
R	Bradley, Fred, Mich	n		n		y		y	n	
D	Bradley, Michael, Pa	n	y	y	n	n	n	y		
R	Bramblett, Ernest, Cal								n	y
R	Brehm, Walter, Ohio				y		y	y	y	y
D	Breen, Edward, Ohio									n
D	Brooks, Overton, La	y		y	n	n	n	n	y	n

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Brophy, John, Wis								n	
D	Brown, Paul, Ga	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
R	Brown, Clarence, Ohio	n	n	n	y	y	y	n	n	y
R	Brumbaugh, Emmert, Pa					y	y	y		
D	Bryson, Joseph, N. C.	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	y
D	Buchanan, Frank, Pa								y	n
D	Buck, Frank, Cal	y		y						
R	Buck, Ellsworth, N. Y.							n	n	
F-L	Buckler, R. T., Minn	y	y	y						
D	Buckley, James, Ill									n
D	Buckley, Charles, N. Y.				n	n			y	
R	Buffett, Howard, Nebr				y	y	y	n	n	
D	Bulwinkle, Alfred, N. C.	y		y	n	n	n	n	y	
D	Bunker, Berkley, Nev						n	y		
D	Burch, Thomas, Va	y	y	y	n			n		
R	Burdick, Usher, N. D.	y	n	y	n	n				n
D	Burleson, Omar, Tex								y	
D	Burnside, M. G., W. Va									n
D	Burgin, W. O., N. C.	y	y	y	n	n	n	y		y
R	Burke, Raymond, Ohio								n	n
R	Busbey, Fred, Ill				y	y			n	
R	Butler, John, N. Y.			n	y	y		y	n	
D	Byrne, William, N. Y.	n			n	n	n	y	y	n
R	Byrnes, John, Wis						y	n	n	y
D	Byrns, Joseph, Tenn		y							
D	Byron, William, Md			y						

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Caldwell, Millard, Fla	y								
D	Camp, Sidney, Va				n	y	n	y	y	y
R	Campbell, Howard, Pa						y	y		
R	Canfield, Gordon, N. J.			n	y	n		y	n	y
D	Cannon, Pat, Fla		y	y	y	n	n	y	y	n
D	Cannon, Clarence, Mo					y		y		
D	Capozzoli, Louis, N. Y.			y		n				
R	Carlson, Frank, Kan	y	y	y	y	y	y	y		
D	Carroll, John A., Cal								y	n
D	Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo						n	y		n
R	Carson, Henderson, Ohio				y	y			n	
R	Carter, Albert, Cal	n	n	n	n					
D	Cartwright, Wilburn, Okla	y		y						
R	Case, Clifford, N. J.						y		n	y
R	Case, Francis, S. D.	y	n		y	y	n		y	y
D	Casey, Joseph, Mass	n		y						y
D	Cavalcante, Anthony, Pa									n
D	Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.				n	n	n		y	n
R	Chadwick, E. Wallace, Pa								n	
D	Chandler, Walter, Tenn	y								
D	Chapman, Virgil, Ky	n	y	y	n	n	y		o	
D	Chelf, Frank, Ky						y	y	y	y
R	Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo				y	y	y		n	
D	Chesney, Chester, Ill									n
R	Chipperfield, Robert, Ill	n	n	n	y	y	y		n	y
D	Christopher, George, Mo									n

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Chudoff, Carl, Pa									n
R	Church, Ralph, Ill	n	n		y	y	y	n	n	y
D	Clark, J. Bayard, N. C.	y	y	y	n	n	n	n	y	
R	Clason, Charles, Mass	n	y		y	y	y	y	n	
D	Claypool, Harold, Ohio	y		y						
D	Clements, Earle, Ky						y	y	o	n
R	Clevenger, Cliff, Ohio	n	n	n	y	y	y	n	n	
R	Clippinger, Roy, Ill							y	n	
R	Cluett, Harold, N. Y.	n								
D	Cochran, John, Mo	y	y	y		n		y		
D	Coffee, Harry, Neb	y	y	y						
D	Coffee, John, Wash	n	y	y	n			y		
R	Coffin, Howard, Mich								n	
R	Cole, Albert, Kan						y	y	n	y
R	Cole, William, Md	n	y	y						
R	Cole, William, Mo				y	y	y		n	
R	Cole, Sterling, N. Y.	n		n	y	y	y		n	y
D	Colmer, William, Miss	y	y	y	y	y	n		y	y
D	Collins, Ross, Miss	y								
D	Combs, J. M., Tex						n	y	y	n
D	Connery, Lawrence, Mass	n	y	y						
D	Cooley, Harold, N. C.	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Cooper, Jere, Tenn	n	y	y	n	n	n		y	y
R	Copeland, Oren, Neb			y						
R	Corbett, Robert, Pa	n					n	y	n	y
D	Costello, John, Cal	n	y		y	y				

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Cotton, Norris, N. H.								n	y
R	Coudert, Frederic, N. Y.								n	y
D	Courtney, Wirt, Tenn		y	y	n	y	y		o	
D	Cox, E. E., Ga	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	y
D	Cravens, Fadjo, Ark		y	y	n	y	n	y	y	
R	Crawford, Fred, Mich		n	n	y	y	y	n	n	y
D	Creal, Edward, Ky			y	n					
D	Crook, Murman, Ind									n
D	Crosser, Robert, Ohio	n	y	y	n	n		y	y	n
R	Crow, William, Pa	y	y						n	
R	Crowther, Frank, N. Y.	n	n	y						
R	Culkin, Francis, N. Y.	n	n							
D	Cullen, Thomas, N. Y.	y		y	n					
R	Cunningham, Paul, Iowa	y	y		y	y	y	y	y	y
D	Curley, James, Mass				n					
R	Curtis, Carl, Neb	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
D	D'Alesandro, Thomas, Md	n	y	y	n	n	n	y		
R	Dague, Paul, Pa								n	y
D	Davenport, Harry, Pa									n
D	Darden, Colgate, Va	n								
D	Davies, John, N. Y.									n
R	Darrow, George, Pa	n								
D	Daughton, Ralph, Va							n		
D	Davis, James, Ga								y	y
D	Davis, Clifford, Tenn		y	y	n	n	n	y	y	y
D	Davis, Jacob, Ohio			y						

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Davis, Glenn, Wis								y	y
R	Dawson, William, Ill				n	n		y	y	n
R	Day, Stephen, Ill			y	y	y				
D	Deane, Charles, N. C.								y	n
D	Delaney, John, N. Y.	y			n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Delaney, James, N. Y.						n	y		
D	Dempsey, John, N. Mex.	y	y							
D	Denton, Winfield, Ind									n
R	Dawson, Wm., Utah								n	
D	DeRousen, Rene, La	y								
R	Devitt, Edward, Minn								n	
R	D'Ewart, Wesley, Mont							y	n	y
R	Dewey, Charles, Ill			n	y	y				
D	Dickstein, Samuel, N. Y.	n		y	n	n	n			
D	Dies, Martin, Tex	y			n	n				
D	Dingell, John, Mich				n	n			o	
R	Dirksen, Everett, Ill	n	n	n	y		y		n	
D	Disney, Wesley, Okla	y			y	y				
R	Ditter, William, Pa		n	n	y					
R	Dolliver, James, Iowa						y	y	y	y
D	Domengeaux, James, La			y	y		y	n	y	
R	Dondero, George, Mich	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Donohue, Harold, Mass	y	y	y	n		n	y	y	y
D	Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.								y	
D	Doughton, Robert, N. C.	y	y	y	n		n	y	y	y
D	Douglas, Helen G., Cal							y	y	

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Douglas, Emily, Ill						n			
R	Douglas, Fred, N. Y.	n		n	y					n
R	Dowell, Cassius, Iowa	y								
D	Downs, LeRoy, Conn			y						
D	Doxey, Wall, Miss	y	y	y						
D	Doyle, Clyde, Cal						n	y		n
D	Drewry, Patrick, Va	y		y	n		n	n	y	
D	Duncan, Richard, Mo	y		y						
D	Dunn, Matthew, Pa	y	y							
D	Durham, Carl, N. C.	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	y
R	Dworshak, Henry, Idaho		n	y	y	y	y	y		
D	Earthman, Harold, Tenn						y	y		
R	Eaton, Thomas, Cal		n							
R	Eaton, Charles, N. J.		n	n				n	n	
D	Eberharter, Herman, Pa	n	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Edelstein, Michael, N. Y.		y							
D	Edmiston, Andrew, W. Va	n	y	y						
D	Eliot, Thomas, Mass			y						
D	Elliott, Alfred, Cal	y		y	y	y	y	y	y	y
R	Ellison, Daniel, Md				n	n				
D	Ellis, Clyde, Ark	y		y						
R	Ellis, Hubert, W. Va				y	y	y	y	n	
R	Ellsworth, Harris, Ore				y	y	y	n	n	y
R	Elsaesser, Edward, N. Y.						y	y	n	
R	Elston, Charles, Ohio	n	n	n	y		y	n	n	y
R	Elmer, Wm. P., Mo				y	y				

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Engel, Albert, Mich	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Engle, Clair, Cal					y	y	y	y	y
D	Englebright, Harry, Cal	n		y						
D	Ervin, Joe, N. C.						n			y
D	Evans, Marcellus, N. Y.	y	y							
D	Evins, Joe, Tenn								y	
D	Faddis, Charles, Pa	n		y						
D	Fallon, George, Md						n	y	y	n
D	Fay, James, N. Y.	n	y			n				
D	Feighan, Michael, Ohio				n	n	n	y	y	n
R	Fellow, Frank, Me			n	y	y	y	P	n	y
R	Fenton, Ivor, Pa	n	n	y	y			y	n	y
D	Ferguson, Phil, Okla	y	y							
D	Fernandez, Joachim, La				y	n	y	y	y	n
D	Fernandez, Antonio, N. Mex	y								
R	Fish, Hamilton, N. Y.	n			y					
D	Fisher, O. C., Tex				y	y	n		y	n
D	Fitzpatrick, James, N. Y.	y		y		n				
D	Flaherty, Thomas, Mass	n		y						
D	Flannagan, John, Jr., Va	y	y	y	n	n	y	y	y	
D	Flannery, Harold, Pa	n		y						
R	Fletcher, Charles, Cal								n	
D	Flood, Daniel, Pa						n	y		n
D	Fogarty, John, R. I.			y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Folger, Alonzo, N. C.	y	y		n	n	n	y	o	
R	Foote, Ellsworth, Conn								n	

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Forand, Aime, R. I.			y	n	n	n	y	y	n
R	Ford, Leland, Cal	n								y
D	Ford, Thomas, Cal	y		y		n				
D	Ford, Aaron, Miss	y		y						
D	Frazier, James, Tenn									y
D	Fries, Frank, Ill	y								
D	Fulbright, William, Ark				n	y				
R	Fuller, Hadwen, N. Y.					y	y	y	o	
D	Fugate, Tom, Va									y
D	Fulmer, Hampton, S. C.	y	y	y						
D	Furcolo, Foster, Mass									n
D	Furlong, Grant, Pa					n				
R	Fulton, James, Pa							y	n	y
D	Gale, Richard, Minn			y	y	n				
R	Gallagher, James, Pa					y	n	y	n	
R	Gamble, Ralph, N. Y.	n	n	n	y		y	n	n	y
R	Gardner, Edward, Ohio						y	y		
D	Garmatz, Edward, Md									n
D	Garrett, Clyde, Tex	y	y							
R	Gartner, Fred, Pa	n	n							
D	Gary, J. Vaughan, Va						n	y	y	y
D	Gathings, E. C., Ark	y	y	y	y	y	y		y	n
D	Gavagan, Joseph, N. Y.	n	y	y		n				
R	Gavin, Leon, Pa				y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Gearhart, Bertrand, Cal	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	
D	Geelan, James, Conn						n	y		

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
P	Gehrmann, Bernard, Wis	y	n	y						
R	Gerlach, Charles, Pa	n	n	n	y		y	y		
D	Geyer, Lee, Cal	y	y	y						
D	Gibbs, W. Ben, Ga	y								
D	Gibson, John, Ga			y	n	y	y	n		
R	Gifford, Charles, Mass	n						n	o	
R	Gilchrist, Fred, Iowa	y		y	y	y				
R	Gillespie, Dean, Colo						y	y		
R	Gillette, Wilson, Pa				y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Gillie, George, Ind	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	
R	Goff, Abe, Idaho								n	
R	Golden, James, Ky									y
R	Goodwin, Angier, Mass		n		y	y	y	n	n	y
D	Gordon, Thomas, Ill				n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Gore, Albert, Tenn	y	y	y	n	n	n	P	y	y
D	Gorski, Martin, Ill				n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Gorski, Chester, N. Y.									n
D	Gossett, Ed, Tex	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	y
R	Graham, Louis, Pa		n	n	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Granahan, William, Pa						n	n		n
D	Granger, Walter, Utah			y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Grant, George, Ala	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	y
R	Grant, Robert, Ind	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	
D	Green, Lex, Fla	y		y		n				n
D	Green, William, Pa						n	y		
D	Gregory, Noble, Ky	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Griffith, John, La	y					y	n		
R	Griffiths, P. W., Ohio				y	y			n	
R	Griswold, Harry, Wis	n								
R	Gross, Chester, Pa	n	n		y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Buyer, U. S., Kan	y	n	n						
R	Gwinn, Ralph, N. Y.						y	n	n	y
R	Gwynne, John, Iowa	y	n	y	y	y	y	n	o	
R	Hagen, Harold, Minn				y	y	y	y	y	n
D	Haines, Harry, Pa			y						
R	Hale, Robert, Me				y	y	y	n	n	y
R	Hall, Edwin A., N. Y.			n		y	y	y	o	y
R	Hall, Leonard, N. Y.	n	n	n	y	y		n	n	y
R	Halleck, Charles, Ind	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	n	y
R	Hancock, Clarence, N. Y.	n		n	y	y		n		
R	Harden, Asie, Ind.									y
R	Hand, T. Millet, N. J.						y	y	n	y
D	Hardy, Porter, Va								y	y
D	Hare, Butler, S. C.	y	y	y	n		n	y		y
D	Harless, Richard, Ariz				n	n	n	y	y	
R	Harness, Forest, Ind	n	n	n		y	y		n	
D	Harrington, Vincent, Iowa	y		y						
D	Harris, Oren, Ark				y	n		n	n	y	n
D	Harris, Winder, Va				y	n	n				
D	Harrison, Burr, Va									y	y
D	Hart, Edward, N. J.	y	y	y	n	n		y	y	n
R	Harter, D. J. Francis, N. Y.	n	n							

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Harter, Dow, Ohio	n								
R	Hartley, Fred, N. J.		y	n	y	n			n	
D	Havenner, Frank, Cal	y				n	y	y	y	n
R	Hawks, Charles, Wis	n	y							
D	Hays, Brooks, Ark			n	n	n			o	n
D	Healey, Ned, Cal							y		
D	Healey, Arthur, Mass	n		y						
D	Hebert, Edward, La			y		n	n	n	o	y
D	Hedrick, E. H.,W. Va						n	y	n	n
D	Heffernan, James, N. Y.			y	n	n	n	y	y	
R	Heidinger, James, Ill			n	y	y				
R	Heinke, George, Neb		n							
D	Heller, Lewis, N. Y.									n
D	Hendricks, Joe, Fla		y		n	n	n		y	
D	Hennings, Thomas, Mo		n				y	y		
D	Herlong, A. S., Fla									y
R	Herter, Christian, Mass				y	n	y	y	n	y
R	Heselton, John, Mass						y		n	y
R	Hess, William, Ohio	n	n	n	y	y	y	n	n	
R	Hill, William, Colo	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Hill, Knute, Wash			y						
R	Hinshaw, Carl, Cal	n	y		y	n	n	y	n	y
D	Hobbs, Sam, Ala	y	y		n			n	y	y
D	Hoch, Daniel				n	n		y		
R	Hoeven, Charles, Iowa				y	y	y	n	y	y
R	Hoffman, Clare, Mich	n	n	n	y	y	y	n	n	y

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Hoffman, Richard, Ill									y
D	Holbrock, Greg, Ohio			n						
D	Holland, Elmer, Pa								y	
D	Holifield, Chet, Cal					n		y		n
R	Holmes, Pehr, Mass	n	y	n	y	y	y	n		
R	Holmes, Hal, Wash				y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Hook, Frank, Mich	y					n			
R	Hope, Clifford, Kan	y		y	y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Horan, Walt, Wash				y	y	y	y	n	
R	Horton, Frank, Wyo	n	n							
D	Houston, John, Kans	y								
R	Howell, Evan, Ill			y	y	y	y	y	n	n
D	Huber, Walter, Ohio						n	y	y	n
R-P	Hull, Merlin, Wis	y	n	y	y	n		y	y	y
D	Hunter, John, Ohio	n	y	y						
D	Irving, Leonard, Mo									n
D	Imhoff, Lawrence, Ohio			y						
D	Izac, Ed, Cal	y		y		n		y		
R	Jackson, Donald, Cal								n	y
D	Jackson, Henry, Wash			y	n	n		y	y	n
D	Jacobs, Andrew, Ind									n
D	Jacobsen, William, Iowa	y		y						
R	James, Benjamin, Pa									y
D	Jarman, Pete, Ala	y	y	y	y	y		n	y	
R	Jarrett, Benjamin, Pa	n	y	n						
R	Javits, Jacob, N. Y.								n	n

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Jeffrey, Harry, Ohio				y	y				
R	Jeffries, Walter, N. J.	n								
R	Jenison, Edward, Ill								n	y
R	Jenkins, Thomas, Ohio				y	y	y	n	n	y
R	Jenkins, Mitchell, Pa								n	
R	Jenks, Arthur, N. H.	n								
R	Jennings, John, Tenn				y	y	y		o	y
R	Jensen, Ben, Iowa	y	n	y	y	y	y	n	o	y
R	Johns, Joshua, Wis		n	n						
R	Johnson, Ward, Cal			n						y
R	Johnson, Leroy, Cal				y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Johnson, Anton, Ill	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	
R	Johnson, Calvin, Ill				y	y				
R	Johnson, Noble, Ind	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	n	
D	Johnson, Glen, Okla								y	
D	Johnson, Jed, Okla	y	y	y	n	y	n	y		
D	Johnson, Luther, Tex	y	y	y	y	n	n	n		
D	Johnson, Lyndon, Tex	y	y		n	n	n	y	o	
R	Jonas, Edgar, Ill									y
D	Johnson, George, W. Va	n	y	y						
D	Jones, Robert, Ala								y	y
D	Jones, Hamilton, N. C.								y	y
R	Jones, Robert, Ohio	n	n	n	y	y	y	n	n	
D	Jones, Paul, Mo									n
D	Jones, Marvin, Tex	y	y							
R	Jones, Homer, Wash								n	

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Jonkman, Bartel, Mich		y	y	y	y	y	y	n	
R	Judd, Walter, Minn				y	n		y	n	y
D	Karsten, Frank, Mo								y	n
R	Kean, Robert, N. J.	n	n	n	y	y	n	n	n	y
R	Kearne, Carroll, Pa								n	y
R	Kearney, Bernard, N. Y.				y	n	y	y	n	y
R	Keating, Kenneth, N. Y.								n	y
D	Kee, John, W. Va	n	y	y	n	n	n	y	o	n
D	Karst, Raymond, Mo									n
R	Keefe, Frank, Wis	n		y	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Kefauver, Estes, Tenn				n	n	n	y	y	
D	Keller, Kent, Ill	y								
D	Kelley, Augustine, Pa					n	n	y	o	n
D	Kelly, Edward, Ill	n			n			y		
D	Kennedy, John, Mass								y	
D	Kennedy, Ambrose, Md	n	y							
D	Kennedy, Martin, N. Y.	n	y							
D	Kennedy, Michael, N. Y.	n	y			n				
D	Keogh, Eugene, N. Y.	y		y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Karsten, Frank, Mo								n	
D	Kerr, John, N. C.	y		y	n	n	n		o	y
R	Kilburn, Clarence, N. Y.					y		n	n	y
D	Kilday, Paul, Tex	y	y	y	y		n	y	y	y
D	King, Cecil, Cal					n		y	y	n
R	Kinzer, Roland, Pa	n	y	y	y	y		y		
D	Kirwan, Michael, Ohio	n		y	n	n	n	y	o	n

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Kitchens, Wade, Ark	y								
D	Kleberg, Richard, Tex	y		y	y	y				
D	Klein, Arthur, N. Y.				n	n			y	n
R	Knutson, Harold, Minn	n		y	y		y	n	n	
D	Kocialkowski, Leo, Ill	y		y						
D	Kipplemann, Herman, Conn						n	y		
D	Kramer, Charles, Cal	n		y						
D	Kruse, Edward, Ind									n
R	Kunkel, John, Pa	n	n	n	y	y	n	y		y
D	LaFollette, Charles, Ind				y	n	y	y		
R	Lambertson, William, Kan	n	n	n	y	y				
R	Landis, Gerald, Ind	n	n	y	y		y		n	
D	Lane, Thomas, Mass				n	n	n		y	n
D	Lanham, Fritz, Tex	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n
D	Larcade, Henry, La				n	n	y	n	y	y
D	Larrabee, William, Ind	y	y	y						
R	Latham, Henry, N. Y.						y	n	n	y
D	Lea, Clarence, Cal	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	
D	Leavy, Charles, Wash	y	y	y						
R	LeCompte, Karl, Iowa	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
R	LeFevre, Jay, N. Y.						y	n	n	y
R	Lemke, William, S. D.				y	y	y	y	y	y
D	Lesinski, John, Mich	n	y					y	y	n
D	Lewis, Lawrence, Colo	n	y	n			y	y		
D	Linehan, Neil, Ill									n
D	Lind, James, Pa									n

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Lewis, Earl, Ohio	n	n		y	y			n	
R	Lichtenwalter, Franklin, Pa									y
D	Link, William, Ill						n	y		
R	Lodge, John D., Conn								n	y
R	Lord, Bert, N. Y.	n								
R	Love, Francis, W. Va								n	
D	Lucas, Wingate, Tex								y	y
R	Lovre, Harold, S. D.									y
R	Luce, Clare B., Conn	n	n		y		y	y		
D	Ludlow, Louis, Ind	n	y	y	n	n	n		o	
D	Lusk, Georgia, N. Mex.								y	
D	Lyle, John, Tex						n	y	y	n
D	Lynch, Walter, N. Y.		y	y	n		n	y	y	n
D	McAndrews, James, Ill	y								
D	McArdle, Joseph, Pa	n	y							
D	McCarthy, Eugene, Minn									n
R	McConnell, Samuel, Pa					y	y	y	n	y
D	McCord, Jim, Tenn				n	n				
D	McCormack, John, Mass	n	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
R	McCowan, Edward, Ohio				y		y	y	n	
R	McDonough, Gordon, Cal						y	y	n	y
R	McCulloch, William, Ohio									y
R	McDowell, John, Pa	n	n						n	
R	McGarvey, J. Harry, Ohio								n	
D	McGehee, Dan, Miss	y	y	y	y	y		y		
D	McGlinchey, Herbert, Pa						n	y		

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	McGrath, Christopher, N.Y.									n
D	McGranery, James, Pa	n			n					
D	McGuire, John, Conn									n
R	McGregor, Harry, Ohio		n	n	y	y	y		n	
D	McKeough, Raymond, Ill	n		y						
D	McKenzie, Charles, La				y	y	y	n		
D	McLaughlin, Charles, Neb	y		y						
R	McLean, Donald, N. J.		n		y	y				
R	McLeod, Clarence, Mich	n	n							
R	McMahon, Gregory, N. Y.								n	
D	McMillan, John, S. C.	y	y	y				y	y	y
D	McMillan, Clara, S. C.		y							
D	McMillan, Thomas, S. C.	y								
R	McMillen, Rolla, Ill				n		y		n	y
D	McMurray, Howard, Wis				n	n				
R	Mack, Russell, Wash								n	y
D	Madden, Ray, Ind				n	n	n	y	y	
R	MacKinnon, George, Minn								n	n
R	Maas, Melvin, Minn	n	n	y	y	y				
R	McWilliams, John, Conn				y					
D	Mack, Peter, Ill									y
D	McSweeney, John, Ohio									n
D	Maciejewski, Anton, Ill	n								
D	Maciora, Lucien, Conn			y						
R	Macy, W. Kingsland, N. Y.								n	y
D	Madden, Ray, Ind									n

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Magee, Clare, Mo									n
D	Magnuson, Warren, Wash	n			n	n				
D	Mahon, George, Tex	y	y	y	n	y	n	y	y	n
D	Maloney, Paul, La	y	y			n		y		
R	Maloney, Franklin, Pa								n	
D	Manasco, Carter, Ala				y			n	y	
D	Mansfield, Mike, Mont				n	n	n	y		
D	Mansfield, Joseph, Tex		y			y	n	n	y	n
R	Mapes, Carl, Mich	n								
A.L.	Marcantonio, Vito, N. Y.	n		y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Maisalis, John, Colo									n
R	Marshall, L. L., Ohio	n	n							n
D	Martin, John A., Colo	y								
R	Martin, Thomas, Iowa	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
R	Martin, Joseph W., Mass	n	n	y	y	y	y	n		y
R	Mason, Noah, Ill					y		n	n	y
D	Massingale, Sam, Okla	y	n							
R	Mathews, Frank, N. J.							n	n	
D	May, Andrew, Ky	n		y	n	y	n	y		
R	Meade, W. Howes, Ky								y	
D	Merritt, Matthew, N. Y.	n		y		n				
R	Merrow, Chester, N. H.				y	y	y		y	y
D	Meyer, John, Md			y						
D	Meyer, Herbert, Kan								n	y
R	Michener, Earl, Mich	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Miles, John, N. Mex									y

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Miller, Thomas, Pa				y	y				
R	Miller, Louis, Mo				y					
D	Miller, George, Cal						n	y	y	n
R	Miller, Edward, Md								n	y
R	Miller, A. L., Neb				y	y	y	n	y	y
R	Miller, William, Conn	n	y		n	y			n	
D	Mills, Wilbur,D., Ark	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n
D	Mills, Newt, La	y		y						
R	Mitchell, E. A., Ind								n	n
D	Mitchell, Arthur, Ill	n								
R	Monkiewicz, B. J., Conn	n	y		y	y				
D	Monroney, A. S. Mike, Okla	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	y
D	Morgan, Thomas, Pa						n	y	y	n
D	Morris, Toby, Okla								y	n
D	Morrison, James, La				y	n	n	y	y	
R	Morton, Thurston, Ky								n	y
D	Moser, Guy, Pa	n	y	y						
R	Mott, James, Ore	n			y	y				
D	Moulder, Morgan, Mo									n
D	Mouton, Robert, La	y	y							
R	Mruk, Joseph, N. Y.				y	n				
R	Muhlenberg, Frederick, Pa								n	
D	Multer, Abraham, N. Y.									n
R	Mundt, Karl, S. D.	y	n	y	y	y	y		y	
D	Murdock, John, Ariz	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Murdock, Abe, Utah	y	y							

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Murphy, John, Pa				n	n	n	y		
D	Murray, Tom, Tenn				n	y	y	y	y	y
R	Murray, Reid, Wis	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	
D	Myers, Francis, Pa	n		y	n	n				
D	Neeley, Matthew, W. Va						n	y		
D	Nelson, William, Mo	y					y			y
D	Newsome, John, Ala					y				
D	Nichols, Jack, Okla	y	y	y	n					
R	Nicholson, Donald, Mass									y
R	Nixon, Richard, Cal								n	y
R	Nodar, Robert, N. Y.								n	
R	Norblad, Walter, Ore							y	y	y
D	Norrell, W. F., Ark	y	y	y	n	y	y	n	y	y
R	Norman, Fred, Wash				y	y				
D	Norton, Mary, N. J.	y	y	y		n	n		y	n
D	Nolan, James, Ind									n
D	O'Brien, Thomas, Ill					n	n	y	y	n
D	O'Brien, George, Mich			y	n	n	n	y		n
R	O'Brien, Joseph, N. Y.	n		n	y	y				
D	O'Connor, James, Mont	y	y	y	y	n				
D	O'Day, Caroline, N. Y.	y								
D	O'Hara, Barratt, Ill									n
R	O'Hara, Joseph, Minn			y		y	y	y	y	y
R	O'Konski, Alvin, Wis				y	n	y	y	y	y
D	O'Leary, James, N. Y.	n	y	y						
R	Oliver, James, Me	n	n	n						

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	O'Neal, Emmet, Ky	n	y	y	n	n		y		
D	O'Neil, Harry, Pa									n
R	Osmers, Frank, N. J.		n	n						
D	O'Sullivan, Eugene, Neb									n
D	O'Toole, Donald, N. Y.	n	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Outland, George, Cal				n	n	n	y		
R	Owens, Thomas, Ill								n	
D	Pace, Stephen, Ga	y		y	n	y	n	y	y	n
D	Parsons, Claude, Ill	y								
D	Passman, Otto, La			n					y	y
D	Patman, Wright, Tex	y	y	y	n		n	y	o	n
D	Patrick, Luther, Ala	y	y	y			n	y		
D	Patten, Harvey, Ariz									n
R	Patterson, James, Conn						n		n	y
D	Patton, Nat, Tex	y	n	y	n	n				
D	Pearson, Herron, Tenn		y							
D	Peden, Preston, Okla								y	
D	Perkins, Carl, Ky									n
D	Peterson, J. Hardin, Fla	y	y	y	n	n	n		y	n
D	Peterson, Hugh, Ga	y			y	y	n			
D	Pfeifer, Joseph, N. Y.	y		y	n	n		y	y	y
R	Pheiffer, William, N. Y.	n								
D	Philbin, Philip, Mass		y				y	y	y	y
R	Phillips, John, Cal								n	y
R	Phillips, Dayton, Tenn					y	y	y	n	y
D	Pickett, Tom, Tex						n	n	y	y

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Pierce, Wallace, N. Y.	n	y							
R	Pittenger, William, Minn½	n	y	y	y	y	y	y		
D	Plauche, Vance, La			y						
R	Ploeser, Walter, Mo				y	y	y	y	n	
R	Plumley, Charles, Vt	n	n	n		y		y	n	y
D	Poage, W. R., Tex	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n
D	Polk, James G., Ohio	y	y							n
R	Potter, Charles, Mich									y
R	Potts, David, N. Y.								n	
R	Poulson, Norris, Cal				y	n			n	y
R	Pracht, Frederick, Pa					y				
D	Powell, Adam, N. Y.							y	o	
R	Powers, D. Lane, N. J.	n	n	n	n	n	y			
D	Preston, Prince, Ga								y	y
D	Price, Melvin, Ill						n	y	y	
D	Price, Emory, Florida				n		n	y	y	n
D	Priest, J. Percy, Tenn			y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Quinn, Peter, N. Y.							y		n
D	Rabaut, Louis, Mich	n	n		n	n	n	y		n
D	Rabin, Benjamin, N. Y.						n	y	y	
D	Rains, Albert, Ala							y	y	y
R	Ramey, Homer, Ohio				y	y	y	y	n	
D	Ramspeck, Robert, Ga	y	y	y	n	n	n			
D	Randolph, Jennings, W. Va	n	y		n	n	n			
D	Rankin, John, Miss	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y
R	Rankin, Jeanette, Mont			y						

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Rayburn, Sam, Tex	y							y	
D	Rayfiel, Leo, N. Y.						n	y	y	
D	Redden, Monroe, N. C.								y	n
R	Reece, B. Carroll, Tenn	n		y	y	y	y	y		
R	Reed, Chauncey, Ill	n	n	n	y		y	y	n	y
R	Reed, Daniel, N. Y.	n	n	n	y	y	y		n	y
R	Rees, Edward, Kan	y	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Reeves, Albert, Mo								n	
R	Regan, Ken, Tex									y
R	Rich, Robert, Pa			n			y	n	n	y
D	Rhodes, George, Pa	n	n							n
D	Ribicoff, Abraham, Conn									n
D	Richards, James, S. C.	y		y	n			y	y	y
R	Riehlman, R. Walter, N. Y.								n	y
D	Riley, John, S. C.						n	y	o	
R	Risk, Charles, R.I.	n	n							
D	Rivers, Mendel, S. C.			y	n	n		y	o	y
R	Rizley, Ross, Okla			y	y	y	y	y	y	
R	Robertson, Charles, N. D.			y			y	y	y	
D	Robertson, A. Willis, Va	y		y	n	y	y			
D	Robinson, J. W., Utah	y		y	n	n	n	y		
R	Robsion, John, Ky	n		n				y	n	
R	Rockefeller, Lewis, N. Y.	n		n						
R	Rockwell, Robert, Colo				y	y	y	y	n	
D	Rodino, Peter, N. J.									n
R	Rodgers, Robert, Pa	n	n	n	y	y	y	y		

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Rogers, Will, Cal				n	n				
D	Roe, Dudley, Md						n	n		
D	Roe, James, N. Y.							n		
R	Rogers, Edith, Mass	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Rogers, George, N. Y.						n	y		
D	Rogers, Dwight, Fla						y	y	y	y
D	Rogers, Will, Okla	y		y						
R	Rohrbough, Edward, W. Va				y	y			n	
R	Rolph, Thomas, Cal			n	y	y				
D	Romjue, Milton, Mo	y	y							
D	Rooney, John, N. Y.						n	y	y	n
D	Rowan, William, Ill				n	n	n	y		
R	Ross, Robert, N. Y.								n	
R	Routzohn, Harry, Ohio	n	n							
D	Russell, Sam, Ill			y		y	n	n		
R	Russell, Charles, Nev								n	
D	Rowe, Dudley, Md					y				
R	Rutherford, Albert, Pa	n	n	n						
D	Ryter, Joseph, Conn							y		
D	Sabath, Adolph, Ill	n		y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Sacks, Leon, Pa	n	y							
R	Sadlack, Antoni, Conn								n	y
D	Sadowski, George, Mich				n	n	n	y	y	n
R	St. George, Katharine, N. Y.								n	y
R	Sanborn, John, Idaho								n	y
R	Sandager, Harry, R. I.		n							

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Sanders, Jared, La			y						
R	Sarbacher, George, Pa								n	
D	Sasscer, Lansdale, Md	y		y	n	n	n	y	y	y
D	Satterfield, Dave, Va	n	y	y	n	n				
P	Sauthoff, Harry, Wis			n	y	y				
D	Savage, Charles, Wash									y
D	Scanlon, Thomas, Pa			y	n	n				
D	Schaefer, Edwin, Ill	y								
R	Schafer, John, Wis	n	y							
R	Schiffler, Andrew, W. Va	n	n		y	y				
D	Schuetz, Leonard, Ill	n		y	n					
D	Schulte, William, Ind	y	y	y						
R	Schwabe, Max, Mo				y	y	y	n	y	
R	Schwabe, George, Okla								y	
D	Schwert, Pius, N. Y.	y	n							
R	Scobliok, James, Pa								n	
R	Scott, Hugh, Pa			n	y	y			n	y
R	Scott, Hardie, Pa								n	y
R	Scrivner, Errett, Kan					y	y	n	n	y
D	Scrugham, James, Nev	y								
R	Scudder, Hubert, Cal									y
R	Seccombe, James, Ohio	n	n							
D	Secrest, Robert, Ohio	n	y	y						y
R	Seely-Brown, Horace, Conn								n	
R	Shafer, Paul, Mich	n	n			y	y	n	n	y
D	Shanley, James, Conn	n		y						

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Shannon, Joseph, Mo	y	y							
R	Sharp, Edgar, N. Y.						y	y		
D	Sheppard, Harry, Cal	y		y	n	n	n	y	o	n
D	Sheridan, John, Pa	n	y			n		y		
R	Short, Dewey, Mo			n		y			n	
D	Sikes, Robert, Fla			y	n	n	n	y	y	n
R	Simpson, Sid, Ill				y	y	y	y	y	y
R	Simpson, Richard, Pa	n	n		y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Simms, Hugo, S. C.									n
D	Slaughter, Roger, Mo				y	y				
D	Smathers, George, Fla								y	n
D	Smith, Joseph, Conn	n	y	y						
D	Smith, T. V., Ill	y								
R	Smith, Wint, Kan								n	y
R	Smith, Margaret C., Me	n	n	n	y	y		y	n	
R	Smith, Frederick, Ohio	n	n	n	y	y	y	n	o	
D	Smith, Francis, Pa			y						
D	Smith, Howard, Va	n	y	y	n		y	n	y	y
D	Smith, Martin, Wash	n		y						
R	Smith, Lawrence, Wis				y	y	y	n	y	y
D	Smith, Joe L., W. Va	n	y	y	n					
D	Snyder, J. Buell, Pa		y	y	n	n		y		
R	Snyder, Melvin, W. Va								n	
D	Somers, Andrew, N. Y.	y	y		n	n		y	y	
D	South, Charles, Tex	y	y	y						
D	Sparkman, John, Ala	y	y	y	n	y	n	y		

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Spence, Brent, Ky	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
R	Springer, Raymond, Ind	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	
D	Stanley, Thomas, Va				y	y			y	
D	Starkey, Frank, Minn						n			
D	Starnes, Joe, Ala	y			y	y				
D	Steagall, Henry, Ala	y			y					
R	Stearns, Foster, N. H.	n		n	y	y				
D	Steed, Tom, Okla									n
R	Stefan, Karl, Neb	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
D	Stewart, Paul, Okla				y	y		n		
R	Stevenson, William, Wis					y	y	y	y	
D	Stigler, William, Okla						n	y	y	n
R	Stockman, Lowell, Ore				y	y	y	n	n	y
R	Stratton, Frank, N. J.								y	
D	Sullivan, John, Mo			y	n	n	n	y		
D	Sullivan, Christopher, N. Y.									n
R	Sumner, Jessie, Ill	y	n		y	y	y	n		
D	Sumners, Hatton, Tex	y	y	y	y		n	n		
R	Sundstrom, Frank, N. J.				y	y	n		n	
D	Sutphin, William, N. J.			y						
D	Sutton, Pat, Tenn									n
D	Sweeney, Martin, Ohio	n		y						
R	Taber, John, N. Y.	n		n	y	y	y	n	n	y
D	Tackett, Boyd, Ark									n
R	Talbot, Joseph, Conn				y		y	y		
R	Talle, Henry, Iowa	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Tarver, Malcolm, Ga	y	n		n	y	n	y		
D	Tauriello, Anthony, N. Y.									n
D	Taylor, Edward, Colo		y							y
R	Taylor, Dean, N. Y.			y	y		y		n	
D	Teague, Olin, Tex								y	n
D	Tenerowicz, Rudolph, Mich	y	y	y						
D	Terry, David, Ark	y	y	y						
R	Thill, Lewis, Wis	n								
D	Thom, William, Ohio			y			y			
R	Thomas, J. Parnell, N. J.	n		n	y	y	y		n	
D	Thomas, Albert, Tex	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
D	Thomason, Ewing, Tex	y	y	y	n	y		y	y	
D	Thompson, Clark, Tex									n
R	Thorkelson, J., Mont	n								
D	Thornberry, Homer, Tex									n
R	Tibbott, Harve, Pa	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	
R	Tinkham, George, Mass		n	n						
D	Rolan, John, Cal	y		y		n	n	y		
R	Tollefson, Thor, Wash								n	y
D	Torrens, James, N. Y.						n	y		
R	Towe, Harry, N. J.				y	n	n	n	n	
D	Traynor, Philip, Del			y				y		
R	Troutman, Wm, Pa				y	y				
R	Treadway, Allen, Mass	n	y							
D	Trimble, James, Ark						n	y	y	n
R	Twyman, Robert, Ill								n	

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
D	Turner, Clarence, Tenn								n	
R	Vail, Richard, Ill								n	y
R	Van Zandt, James, Pa	n	n	n						
D	Underwood, Thomas, Ky									y
R	Velde, Harold, Ill									y
D	Vincent, Beverly, Ky	y	y	y	n	y				
D	Vinson, Carl, Ga	y		y		y	n	y	o	y
D	Voorhis, Jerry, Cal	y	y		n	n	n	y		
R	Vorys, John, Ohio	n	n	n	y	y		n	n	y
R	Vreeland, Albert, N. J.	n	n	n						
R	Vursell, Charles, Ill				y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Wadsworth, James, N. Y.	n			y	y	y	n	n	y
D	Wagner, Earl, Ohio									n
D	Wallgren, Mon C., Wash	n								
D	Walsh, John, Ind									n
D	Walter, Francis, Pa	n	y	y	n	n		y	y	n
D	Ward, David, Md		y	y	y	y				
D	Warren, Lindsay, N. C.	y								
D	Wasielewski, Thad, Wis			n	n	n	n	y		
D	Weaver, Zebulon, N. C.	y		y	n	n	n	y		
R	Weichel, Alvin, Ohio				y	y	y	y	n	y
D	Weiss, Samuel, Pa			y	n	n	n			
D	Welch, Phil, Mo									n
R	Welch, Richard, Cal	n		y	n	n	n	y	n	n
D	Wene, Elmer, N. J.				n	n		n		
D	West, Milton, Tex	y		y	y	y	y		y	

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Wheat, William, Ill	n	n	y	y					
D	Wheeler, W. M., Ga								y	y
D	Whelchel, B. Frank, Ga	y	n	y	y					
D	Whitaker, John, Ky									y
D	White, Compton, Idaho	y			n	n	y			n
D	White, Cecil, Cal									n
R	White, Dudley, Ohio	n								
D	Whitten, Jamie, Miss				y	y	y	n	y	y
D	Whittington, William, Miss	y	n	y	y	y	n	n	y	y
D	Wickersham, Victor, Okla			y	n	n	y	P		n
R	Wiggelsworth, Richard, Mass	n		n	y	y			n	y
D	Wier, Roy, Minn									n
R	Williams, George, Del	n								
D	Williams, John, Miss								y	y
D	Willis, Edwin, La									n
D	Williams, Clyde, Mo	y		y						
R	Willey, Earl D., Del				y	y				
R	Wilson, Earl, Ind			y	y	y		y	y	y
D	Wilson, Frank, Tex								y	y
R	Winter, Thomas, Kan	n		n						
D	Wilson, George, Okla									n
D	Winstead, Arthur, Miss				y	y	y	n	y	y
R	Winter, Thomas, Kan				y					
R	Wolcott, Jesse, Mich	n	n	n	y	y	y	n	n	y
R	Withrow, Gardner, Wis									y
R	Wolfenden, James, Pa	n		n	y	y		y		

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R	Wolverton, Charles, N. J.	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	n	y
D	Wood, John, Ga	y						n	y	y
D	Woodhouse, Chase, Conn							y		n
R	Woodruff, Roy, Mich	n	n		y	y	y	n	n	y
D	Woodrum, Clinton, Va		y		n	y	n			
D	Worley, Eugene, Tex			y	n	y		n	y	n
D	Wright, James, Pa			y	n	n				
R	Youngdahl, Oscar, Minn	n	n	n						
D	Yates, Sidney, Ill									n
D	Young, Stephen, Ohio			y						n
D	Zablocki, Clement, Wis									n
D	Zimmerman, Orville, Mo	y	n	y	n	n	n	y	y	
R	Youngblood, Harold, Mich									n

The so-called farm bloc did not stand up on the vote for $250,000,000 for parity payments on wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco. None of the "perishable food" states voted for the amendment. Perishable foods were not to be supported with the $250,000,000. Congressmen from fruit-growing states, therefore, voted against the measure.

Although the legislation had Democratic sponsorship, four of Washington state's Democratic congressmen voted against the amendment--while only one Democratic congressman from the state was for it.

In New York state 10 Democratic congressmen joined 19 Republicans in voting against the amendment. Nine, all Democrats, voted for it. More Democratic congressmen in the state opposed the amendment than supported it --even though the party supported it.

The amendment found its strongest support, irrespective of party affiliations, in the wheat, corn, cotton and rice states. For example, eight Republicans from Iowa joined the state's two Democratic legislators in supporting the amendment. No one from Iowa opposed the bill. Corn was to be supported.

Nebraska's delegation (wheat and corn) cast no negative votes; its two Republicans joined its two Democrats to make it unanimous.

Missouri (corn, wheat, and cotton) supported the amendment unanimously with their nine Democratic votes.

The solid South--Georgia, Texas, North Carolina, Mississippi, and Arkansas --cast 55 votes for the measure and one against it. All are Democrats, but had cotton not been one of the crops to have been supported, many likely would have kicked over party traces--as Northern Democrats in fruit-growing states did.

The difficulty in forming a farm-labor coalition is shown by the voting of representatives from industrial and mining states.

Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, Massachussetts, West Virginia and New Jersey cast a total of 33 negative votes compared with only four affirmative. The negative votes included those of 12 Democrats. One Republican was among the four favoring the amendment. The inability of the party organization to keep in line Democrats from states not benefitting from the legislation defeated the amendment 204 to 191.

The farm bloc held up only in states producing the non-perishables to be supported. Later legislation supporting more products picked up enough votes to be passed easily. It appeared in this 1939 vote that small bits would chip off the farm bloc for perishables, or that the farm bloc could be split wide open by removing any one of the basic crops from the support list.

The 1945 vote to defer agricultural workers from military service illustrated the effectiveness of the party whip in cracking the farm bloc. The bill to defer agricultural workers had been passed and vetoed. This was the recorded vote on the motion to pass it over Harry Truman's veto.

It definitely was a political vote--probably with all Democratic pressures applied--to uphold the party leader President Truman. Passing it over his veto would have been a distinct slap in the face for the Democratic party. Here the party was much stronger than the farm bloc. Democratic representatives--from farm, industrial, and mixed states alike--joined to see that the motion to pass the legislation over the President's veto was defeated. Exceptions came largely from Southern Democrats--some of whom later became Dixiecrats.

Of the 186 representatives who voted for passage over the President's veto, only 37 were Democrats. Twenty-two of the 37 were from Southern states.

Party regularity was still more evident among the Republicans. Only 11 Republicans voted to uphold the President's veto. Among states where party organizations are strong, like New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Illinois--voting followed strict party lines. New York's 17 Republican legislators voted yea. Its 14 Democratic legislators voted nay. Twelve of 14 Republicans in Pennsylvania favored passage of the bill; all eleven Democrats voted to uphold the veto. Ohio's 14 Republicans were unanimous in supporting the President's veto. In Illinois, 13 Republicans voted yea; its ten Democrats, nay.

Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas--solidly Republican--voted unanimously to pass the legislation over the President's veto.

VOTES CAST IN UNITED STATES SENATE ON SELECTED AGRICULTURAL ACTS

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
D	Adams, Alva, Colo	n	y								
R	Aiken, George, Vt	y	y	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	n
D	Anderson, Clinton, N. M.										n
D	Andrews, Charley, Fla	n	n	o						y	
R	Austin, Warren, Vt	y	y	y	n	y	n				
D	Bailey, Josiah, N. C.			n	n	n					
R	Baldwin, Raymond E., Conn							y	y		n
R	Ball, Joseph, Minn	y		y	n	n	n	o	y		
D	Bankhead, John, Ala	n	n	n							
R	Barbour, W. Warren, N. J.	y		o							
D	Barkley, Alben W., Ky	n	n	y	n	y	n	y			
D	Bilbo, Theodore, Miss			n	n	y	y				
D	Bone, Homer, Wash	n	y	y							
R	Brewster, Ralph, Me	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	n	o
R	Bricker, John W., Ohio							y	n	n	o
R	Bridges, Styles, N. H.	y		y				o	y	n	n
D	Briggs, Frank P., Mo				n	y	n				
R	Brooks, Wayland, Ill	y		n	y		y	y	n		
D	Brown, Prentiss, Mich	n									
R	Buck, C. Douglass, Del			n		n	y	y	n		
D	Bulow, W. J., S. D.	y									
D	Bunker, Berkeley, Nev	n	y								
R	Burton, Harold, Ohio	y	y	y	y						
R	Bushfield, Harlan J., S.D.			n	y	n	y	y	n		
R	Butler, Hugh, Neb	y		o	y	n	y	y	y	n	y

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
D	Byrd, Harry Flood, Va	n	y	y	n	n	y	o	y	n	n
D	Byrnes, James, S. C.	n									
R	Cain, Harry P., Wash							y	y	n	n
R	Capehart, Homer E., Ind				y		y	y	n		n
R	Capper, Arthur, Kan	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y		
D	Caraway, Hattie, Ark	n	n	n							
D	Carville, E. P., Nev					y	y				
D	Chandler, Albert, Ky	n		o	n						
D	Chapman, Virgil, Ky									n	n
D	Chavez, Dennis, N. M.	n	y	n	n	y		y	n	y	o
D	Clark, Bennet Champ, Mo	y		n							
D	Clark, D. Worth, Idaho			n							
D	Connally, Tom, Tex	n	n	n			y	y	y	y	y
R	Cooper, John Sherman, Ky							y	y		
R	Cordon, Guy, Oreg					n	y	y	y	n	y
R	Davis, James J., Pa	y	n	o							
R	Danaher, John, Conn	y	y	y							
R	Donnell, Forrest C., Mo				y	n	n	y	y	n	n
D	Douglas, Paul H., Ill									y	n
D	Downey, Sheridan, Cal			n	n		n	y		n	y
R	Dworshak, Henry C., Idaho							y	y		
D	Eastland, James, Miss		y	n	n		y	y		n	n
R	Ecton, Zales N., Mont							y	y	n	y
D	Ellender, Allen, La	n		n	n	y	n	y		y	o
R	Ferguson, Homer, Mich			n	n	y	y	y	y	n	n
R	Flanders, Ralph E., Vt							y	n	n	n

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
D	Frear, J. Allen, Del									n	o
D	Fulbright, J. Wm., Ark				n	y	y	y	n		y
D	George, Walter, Ga	n	n	n	n	y		y	n		y
D	Gerry, Peter, R. I.	n		y	n	y	n				
D	Gillette, Guy, Iowa		n	n						n	n
D	Glass, Carter, Va		y	o							
D	Gossett, Chas. C., Idaho					y	y				
D	Graham, Frank, N. C.										n
D	Green, Theodore, R. I.	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	y		n
D	Guffey, Joseph, Pa	n	n	y	n	y	n				
R	Gurney, Chan, S. D.	y	y	y	y	n		y	n		y
D	Harrison, Pat, Miss	n									
R	Hart, Thomas C., Conn					n	n				
D	Hatch, Carl, N. M.	n	n	y	n		n	y	n		
R	Hawkes, Albert W., N. J.			n	y		y	o	y		
D	Hayden, Carl, Ariz	n	n	n	n	y	n	o		y	y
R	Hendrickson, Robert, N. J.									n	n
D	Herring, Clyde, Iowa	n									
R	Hickenlooper, Bourke, Iowa					n	y	y	y	n	n
D	Hill, Lister, Ala	n	n	n	n	y		y	n	y	y
D	Hoey, Clyde R., N. C.				n	y	y	y	y		n
D	Holland, Spessord L., Fla							y	n	y	n
R	Holman, Rufus, Ore	y		n							
D	Huffman, James W., Ohio					y	n				
D	Hughes, James, Del	n	y								
D	Humphrey, Hubert, Minn									y	y
D	Hunt, Lester, Wyo									y	y

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
R	Ives, Irving M., N. Y.							y	n	n	n
R	Jenner, Wm. E., Ind							y	n		o
D	Johnson, Edwin, Colo	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
R	Johnson, Hirman, Cal			o	y						
D	Johnson, Lyndon, Tex									y	y
D	Johnston, Olin D., S. C.				n	y	y	y	y	y	y
D	Kefauver, Estes, Tenn									y	y
R	Kem, James P., Mo							y	n	n	n
D	Kerr, Robert, Okla									y	y
D	Kilgore, Harley, W. Va	n		y	n			y		y	n
R	Knowland, Wm. F., Cal					y	n	y	y	n	o
P	LaFollette, Robert M.,Jr.,Wis	y	y	n	n	y	n				
R	Langer, William, N. D.	y	y	o	y		y	y		y	y
D	Lee, Josh, Okla	n	y								
R	Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr.,Mass	y	y	y				y	y	n	o
D	Long, Russell, La									y	y
D	Lucas, Scott, Ill	n		n	n		n	y	y	y	n
D	McCarran, Patrick, Nev	y	y	n		y		y		n	o
R	McCarthy, Joseph R., Wis							o	n	n	y
D	McClellan, John L., Ark			n	n	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	McFarland, Ernest W., Ariz	n	y	o	n	y	y	y	n	y	y
D	McGrath, J. Howard, R. I.							y	y		
D	McKellar, Kenneth, Tenn	n	y	o	n	y	y	y	y	n	y
D	McMahon, Brien, Conn				n	y	n	y	y	y	n
R	McNary, Chas. L., Oreg	y		n							
D	Magnuson, Warren G., Wash					y	n	y		y	n

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
R	Malone, Geo. W., Nev							y		n	y
D	Maloney, Francis, Conn	n	y	y							
R	Martin, Edward, Pa							y		n	n
D	Maybank, Burnet, S. C.			n		y	y	y	n		y
D	Mead, James, N. Y.	n		y	n	y	n				
D	Miller, Bert, Idaho										n
D	Miller, John E., Ark	n									
R	Millikian, Eugene D., Colo			n	y	n	y	y	y	n	n
D	Mitchell, Hugh B., Wash				n	y	n				
R	Moore, E. H., Okla			n	y	n	y	o	n		
R	Morse, Wayne, Oreg				n	y	n	y	n	y	n
R	Mundt, Karl, S. D.									n	y
D	Murdock, Abe, Utah	n		y	n	y	n				
D	Murray, James, Mont	y		o			n	y	n		y
D	Myers, Francis J., Pa				n	y	n	y	n	y	n
D	Neeley, Matthew, W. Va									y	y
I	Norris, George, Neb	y									
R	Nye, Gerald, N. D.	y		n							
D	O'Conor, Herbert R., Md							y	y	n	o
D	O'Daniel, W. Lee, Tex				y		y	y	n		
D	O'Mahoney, Joseph, Wyo	n		y	y		n	y	y	y	y
D	Overton, John, La	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y		
D	Pepper, Claude, Fla	n	n	n		y	n	y		y	y
D	Radcliffe, George, Md	n	n	y	n	y	y				
R	Reed, Clyde, Kan			y	y		y	o			o
R	Revercomb, Chapman W., Va			n	y		n	y	n		
D	Reynolds, Robert, N. C.	y		y							

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
D	Robertson, A. Willis, Va			n	y	y		y	y		n
R	Robertson, Edw. V., Wyo							o			
	Rosier, Joseph, W. Va		n								
D	Russell, Richard, Ga	n	n	o		y	y	y			y
R	Saltonstall, Leverett, Mass				n	n	n	y	y	n	n
R	Schoeppel, Andrew, Kans									n	n
D	Schwartz, Harry, Wyo	n	n								
D	Sowgham, James C., Nev			y							
D	Sheppard, Morris, Tex	n									
R	Shipstead, Henrik, Minn (Formerly F-L)	y	y	n	y		y				
D	Smathers, William, N. J.	n	n								
R	Smith, Margaret C., Me									n	n
D	Smith, Ellison, S. C.		n	n	n	n	n	y	y		
R	Smith, H. Alexander, N. J.										o
D	Sparkman, John J., Ala							y	n	y	o
R	Stanfill, Wm. A., Ky						y	y			
D	Stennis, John C., Miss									n	y
D	Stewart, Tom, Tenn	n		n	n	y	y	y	y		
R	Taft, Robert, Ohio	y	y	n	y	n	n	o	y	n	o
D	Taylor, Glen H., Idaho					n		n	y	n	y	y
R	Thomas, John, Idaho		y	y	o						
D	Thomas, Elbert, Utah	n	n	o	n	y	n	y		y	o
D	Thomas, Elmer, Okla				n	n		y	y		y	y
R	Thye, Edw. J., Minn								y	y		n
R	Tobey, Charles, N. H.		y	y	n	n	y		o	n		o
D	Truman, Harry, Mo		n	n	y						

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
I	Tunnell, James, Del	n	n	y	n	y	n				
I	Tydings, Millard, Md	n	y	y	n	n	y	o		n	o
D	Umstead, Wm. B., N. C.							y	y		
R	Vandenberg, Arthur, Mich	y	y	y		y	n	y	y	n	o
I	VanNuys, Frederick, Ind			y							
D	Wagner, Robert, N. Y.			y	n		n	o			
D	Wallgren, Mon C., Wash	n		o							
D	Walsh, David, Mass	y	y	y	n	y	n				
R	Watkins, Arthur V., Utah							y	y	n	y
D	Wheeler, Burton, Mont	y	y	n		y					
R	Wherry, Kenneth S., Nebr			n	y	n	y	y	n	n	o
R	White, Wallace, Me	y		y	y		y	y			
R	Wiley, Alexander, Wis	y		y	y		y	y		n	o
R	Williams, John J., Del							o	n	n	n
R	Willis, Raymond, Ind	y	y	n	y	n	y				
R	Wilson, George A., Iowa			n			y	y	n		
D	Withers, Garrett, Ky									n	y
R	Young, Milton R., N. D.				y	y	y	y	y	y	y

The vote in the Senate on the amendment to the National Defense Act to prohibit procurement of agricultural products outside of the United States in 1941 was strictly a party vote--not a farm bloc vote.

Not a Republican voted nay. Eight Democrats, one Progressive, and one Independent joined 26 Republicans for a total of 36 favoring the amendment. Forty-seven Democrats followed the party line and defeated the amendment.

The farm as a bloc did not appear to enter the voting at all. It was

instead a party-line vote with isolationists, rather than agriculturalists, kicking over party traces. Democrats Edwin Johnson of Colorado, W. J. Bulow of South Dakota, Pat McCarran of Nevada, Champ Clark of Missouri, David Walsh of Massachusetts, Burton Wheeler and James Murray of Montana, and Bob Reynolds of North Carolina favored the amendment. All were known isolationists of one degree or another.

Four years--and following War II--the Senate rejected a similar amendment 49 to 27. The 1945 amendment would have prohibited any decrease in tariffs on agricultural products. During the four years, several former isolationists had become internationalists. It was largely the Republican internationalists who provided the extra margin in defeating the measure four years later.

For example, George Aiken and Warren Austin of Vermont, now internationalists, switched as did Ball of Minnesota, Tobey of New Hampshire, LaFollette of Wisconsin and David Walsh of Massachusetts. The war apparently had converted them. All previously had favored prohibition of agricultural purchases outside the United States. Democrats still voting isolationist this issue were Lee O'Daniel of Texas, O'Mahoney of Wyoming and Edwin Johnson of Colorado. Although all are from agricultural states, probably it was their isolationism, rather than their "agriculturalism" which kept them across the fense from Democrats who, generally, opposed the amendment.

The 1949 vote in the Senate to make 90 percent parity prices mandatory passed after the Vice President voted for it breaking the 37 to 37 tie.

Obviously Democratic legislation--shown by the Vice President's vote--the amendment still was not supported by several leading Democrats: Lucas of Illinois, Myers of Pennsylvania, Graham and Hoey of North Carolina, Magnuson of Washington and other not-so-staunch Democrats.

The new England states of Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Connecticut cast nine votes against the amendment; none for it. Other states voting against the amendment included New York, New Jersey and Delaware.

Support for the bill came from states like North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Oklahoma, Tennessee, South Carolina, Arizona, Georgia, Arkansas, and Texas. States that did not oppose the amendment but cast only one vote for it included Nebraska, California, Louisiana, Alabama, Nevada, Wisconsin, Idaho and Utah.

Twenty-seven Democrats and 10 Republicans voted for it. Twenty Republicans and 17 Democrats opposed it. Could that be called a party vote? Yes, except for Senators from industrial states who opposed it, regardless of party. The farm states, with notable exceptions, voted for it.

Farm state defections included Schoeppel of Kansas against it; both Gillette and Hickenlooper of Iowa; Harry Cain and Warren Magnuson of Washington, both Senators from Missouri, North Carolina and other states with one senator voting against the amendment; the other, not voting.

It appeared more logical to the writer to analyze this vote as "democratic" with defections rather than "agricultural" with defections. Like the House vote analyzed, this legislation was supported by Democrats, except those in industrial states where supported prices were to be felt more by consumers (buyers) than noticed by producers (sellers) of food and fiber.

Neither the farm bloc nor party affiliations will stand up against legislation that is going to be felt in the purse.

It appears that the Democratic party supported enough farm products--basic and perishable--to win an election two years ago. Agricultural states that the pollsters had in the Republican bag voted Democratic. Had fewer

crops been supported, perhaps fewer Democratic candidates would have been supported.

The fallacy of "buying" elections is that they must be paid for. Carried to its logical conclusion, everyone in America should have "parity" for his grown and manufactured products and for his labor. But taxing various segments to support other segments of society leads to as many inequities as it removes.

To carry votes with crop supports, minimum wage laws, free medical service, or other attractions, a party must plan one American segment of society against another.

The study indicated that rural and urban segments are highly interdependent; that they go up and down the economic ladder together, that prosperity depends on world supplies of goods and money and world demands for goods, services and money.

Perhaps all segments of world society would be better off under free world markets.

A LOOK AT THE PRESENT FARM PROGRAM AND SOME OF ITS FORERUNNERS

The Need for a Program

A study of markets for farm products since World War I indicates that something is needed to stabilize farm prices with the rest of the economy. Within the lifetime of farmers not yet middle-aged prices for most basic crops have varied at least eight to one. Wheat has fluctuated between 44 cents and $3.33 a bushel; corn 22 cents to $2.88; rye, 30 cents to $4.08;

cotton between 5 and 40 cents a pound.[1]

That is considered proof enough that prices should be stabilized. But is the current program, the Brannan plan, or any other government-control plan the answer?

Semi-monopolies or simple restriction of production can keep prices up for the things a farmer must buy. When automobiles, tractors or hairpins stack up on floors and shelves of wholesalers and retailers, production of those articles slows down.

Farmers are unable to use this simple technique other segments of the economy practice. When the price of wheat, cotton, corn or tung nuts goes down, the farmer producing them needs to raise more to get the same take-home pay. Left unaided, he would produce more hoping to offset the lower price. But his over-production would only drive prices still lower.

To get the farmer out of this dilemma (and to get his vote) farm programs have established a political price high enough to hold the farmer loyal to the party in power. Or so it appeared in recent elections. Meantime, the politicians have been unable (and will be in the future unable) to control foreign prices, still governed by supply and demand. So the program has become self-defeating.

A recent example proves that point. The price of potatoes was pegged too high. The high price kept consumers from buying potatoes. The high price also caused farmers to raise more potatoes. Consequently, the commodity purchase program intensified an UNbalanced supply and demand. Newspaper men put the program under the public eye. The public, through representatives in the national legislature, had potatoes withdrawn from the

---

[1] Congressional Digest, "Would the Brannan Plan Be a Sound Policy," March 1950, p. 86.

support program.

The rise in the price of potatoes was hard on urban consumers, particularly the unemployed and those in the lower salary brackets who needed cheap potatoes. It was hard on taxpayers who had to support the potato program. It threw the potato farmer back on his own resources, which may not have been bad.

In addition, F. R. Yoder, points out that such programs keep submarginal farmers on the land and impair foreign markets needed in a country practicing production of plenty.[1]

When Congress legislates high price-supports, they lead to overproduction (barring wars, droughts and other irregular economic pressures); overproduction leads to dumping, which leads to public resentment. Also, with price-supports come controls.

The American system always has thrived on competition which gave us surpluses, with low prices and all their other complexities. To the author, this seems infinitely better than famine. He thinks the policy of subsidies and doles to the farmer from anybody or everybody may seem justified from a study of tariffs and other aids to industry. But any segment of society taking unearned economic advantage of another segment will not prevent both segments from ending in the same dust with ancient civilizations.

Agriculture may be the last segment to have found this new and strange religion of seeking external aids to its problems. If subsidies are defendable for one class of society, they could be defended with equal logic for all classes. Carried to its logical end, every segment of society would pay every other segment a subsidy so all would have parity and equalization of

---

[1] F. R. Yoder, Introduction to Agricultural Economics (New York: The Macmillan Company), 1938, p. 481.

opportunity.

A Collier's editorial writer said, "We don't think that taxing the income of all to guarantee the income--and, hopefully the political support--of some is promoting the general welfare."[1]

Price supports, also, have been shown to effectively curb exports. They therefore lead toward isolation and economic nationalism when the world needs economic cooperation.[2]

The current farm program is stressing a back-to-grass and livestock program in wheat and cotton states. Extension news releases, the soil conservation program, and the Production Marketing Association all point to saving the soil, balanced farm programs, marketing crops on hoof. But at the same time, subsidies (hidden in the form of price supports) are a more powerful force working against the back-to-grass and livestock idea. The subsidies or "parity prices" are based on past production records and past prices. They do not recognize any shift in production, any shift in consumer demands, or any increase in efficiency. Instead, they tend to promote more production of the same crops. With "parity" prices guaranteed for the cotton and wheat, farmers have felt they could not afford to make shifts to new crops and animals.

The supports also tend to slow up movement of farm people into other fields--which may be one of their objectives. However, many argue that persons on marginal lands should be moved into industry and that the "marginal" acres should go to grass or other farm crops adapted to existing conditions.

But who is to define marginal land? And when will he offer his definition?

---

[1] Collier's, "Yes But Whose Welfare?" Mar. 4, 1950, p. 74.

[2] O. B. Jesness, Journal of Farm Economics, "Postwar Agricultural Policy --Pressure vs. General Welfare," Feb. 1946, p. 5.

When wheat was 40 cents a bushel, thousands of acres of the Great Plains regions were considered marginal. The war brought demands for more production, wheat went past $2 a bushel. The so-called marginal acres, besides being necessary in the war effort, produced money enough in a few years for the "marginal" land tenders to retire in comfort. And venture capital vied to pay $10C an acre for the marginal acres that previously had gone begging at $1,000 for 160 acres.[1]

E. C. Stakman said poor prices made the wheat acres marginal. "With wheat at 40 cents, they are marginal; at $2 they are highly profitable."[2]

Senator Scott Lucas, recent majority leader in the United States Senate, spoke of the present farm bill as permanent.[3] If the present farm program continues, many acres formerly called "marginal" will be considered profitable. War III, now in Korea, spreading to other parts of the globe undoubtedly will help define many former marginal acres as essential acres.

On the other hand, should a miraculous peace come and supports be withdrawn, the whole southwest would be thrown out of the cotton business. Small farmers and sharecroppers could not meet competition of mechanized producers in the Delta country, High Plains and the irrigated lands of California and Arizona.[4]

So it looks as if the government will continue to muddle through with a farm program changing to meet social, economic and war problems. A muddling United States farm program looked as if it were superior long-range planning

---

[1]Records in nearly any one of the thirty-some western Kansas county court houses will show real estate transfers substantiating this statement.

[2]E. C. Stakman, "Science in the Service of Agriculture," The Scientific Monthly Feb. 1949, p. 78.

[3]"The Compromise Farm Bill," The Nation Oct. 29, 1949, p. 406.

[4]"1950's Never-Normal Granary," Business Week Mar. 4, 1950, p. 32.

when the United States went to war with Germany and Japan. Surpluses that had been described as the ruination of the country and used to "prove" that the farm program was in inept hands weighed heavily on the balance for survival during War II.

Recent subsidies have brought on more surpluses. Again economists and editorial writers are pointing to "intolerable abuses" in the farm program.[1]

Again it looks as if war may wipe out all surpluses and give the "marginal" acres some such title as "survival" acres.

In peace or war, all man's food and much of his raiment come from plants --recognizing that animals are merely transformers of plant products. So agriculture is fundamental to human subsistence in war or peace.[2]

Whether a farm editor agrees with the present farm program or not, he must understand it to interpret it to his readers, both rural and urban. It cannot be denied that the farm program touches the lives of all consumers, taxpayers, and producers of food.

R. F. Martin saw the beginning of the present farm program with the secondary post-war depression in 1929. That depression lasted until 1932 or 1933--Republicans prefer the former date; Democrats the latter. Prosperity (town and rural) collapsed and foreign trade dropped off. Congress, in 1930, passed a protective tariff act. It caused other nations to impose tariffs and curb foreign trade. The tariffs accentuated the depression and promised complete collapse of international relationships, commercial and financial.[3]

Roosevelt's program attempted to restore prices of farm products to pre-

---

[1]"Lining Deep Pockets," Commonweal Mar. 17, 1950, p. 597.

[2]Stackman, op. cit., p. 75.

[3]R. F. Martin, Income in Agriculture, 1929-1935 (New York: National Industrial Conference Board, Inc.), 1936, p. 109.

depression levels. His economic advisers reasoned that if the value of the gold dollar were reduced, people would not want the dollar so much, that they would give it up more easily for commodities. This was to raise the price of commodities, including farm products. Consequently the weight of the gold dollar was reduced to 60 percent of the weight established in 1900.

The devaluation tended to raise the prices of goods of purely domestic marketing (such as manufactured goods) but not of goods (such as farm products) disposed of largely in foreign markets.

Net effect of devaluation of the dollar was to give the farmer no more for his products, but to make him pay more for the goods he purchased.[1]

The New Deal had followed social economics instead of business economics. It apparently did not realize that world supplies and world demand were the factors that most influence farm prices.

Next came destruction of livestock and crops. This despite philosophers and scholars pointing out that democracy and liberalism were closely associated with plenty, autocracy and tyranny with scarcity and want.[2]

In 1937 Henry Wallace's ever-normal granary scheme was accepted. It sounded the same as the policy of ancient civilizations and medieval cities of storing grain in years of plenty against a year of scarcity and famine. Actually it did not aim for abundance. It was a device to increase the income of farmers.

Since then, farmers have received subsidies in the guise of conservation payments. However, the conservation payment program since has been corrected somewhat with payments going more for permanent and soil-building practices.

---

[1] Gras, op. cit., p. 448.

[2] E. Parmalee Prentice, Farming for Famine (New York: The Macmillan Company), 1936, p. 109.

Now the subsidy comes in supported prices. These developed during War II. Each time the government needed increased production of a certain crop, the crop was placed on the support list. An act providing for 90 percent of parity payments two years after the end of hostilities (not end of shooting) carried through to 1948. A stop-gap law extended supports another year. Then in 1949, another stop-gap law became the one now effective. Nearly any farm product can be supported under the present law, if Congress provides appropriations for the support.

Six basic commodities included in the present program are corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco and peanuts. A non-basic group includes wool, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat. These are to be supported between 60 and 90 percent of parity.

The Congressional Digest provides a muster of commodities now being supported or scheduled to be supported, if necessary, during 1950:[1]

Cotton - American Egyptian 1½-inch: Arizona-California area 57.8 cents a pound; New Mexico-Texas area 58.1 cents a pound; stored 7/8-inch upland: 27.2 cents a pound; middling 15/16-inch: 29.4 cents a pound.

Cottonseed, $37 to $49.50 a ton depending on various circumstances.

Dairy products: butter, 62 cents a pound; dry milk (non fat), 11 to 12.7 cents a pound; cheddar cheese, 21.7 cents a pound; evaporated milk, $3.95 a case.

Fats and oils: tung nuts, $60 a ton; tung oil, 22.7 cents a pound; peanuts, $187 to $209 a ton, depending on locale and type.

Fruits and vegetables: Irish potatoes (before supports were removed), $1.80 a hundredweight; sweet potatoes, $1 to $2 a hundredweight, depending

---

[1] "Congress Explores the Brannan Plan," Congressional Digest Mar. 1950, p. 69-70.

on type and grade.

Grains: winter cover seed, 4.5 cents to 14 cents a pound, depending on type; hay and grass seed, 5 cents to $1.25 a pound, depending on type (average is around 30 cents a pound); dry edible beans, from $6.40 to $8.85 a hundredweight; dry edible peas, $2.87 to $3.10 a hundredweight, depending on locale and type; grain sorghums, $2.09 a hundredweight; barley, $1.09 a bushel; corn, $1.29 to $1.66 a bushel (national average of $1.40 a bushel); wheat, average $1.95 a bushel, top grade $2.16 to $2.38 a bushel; oats, 69 cents a bushel; rye, $1.27 a bushel.

Rice, national average about $3.96 a hundredweight; flaxseed, $3.69 to $3.99 a bushel, depending on locale; soybeans, $1.91 to $2.11 a bushel, depending on type.

Livestock: hogs, $14.20 to $16.40 a hundredweight, depending on season; wool, 42.3 cents a pound for national average.

Poultry: eggs, average rate of 37 cents a dozen varying seasonally with type; turkeys, national average of 31 cents a pound.

Tobacco, naval stores, 26.9 to 42.5 cents a pound, depending on type and season, gum naval stores, 40 cents a gallon of turpentine and $6.72 a hundred weight for resin.

The law in brief makes it mandatory that "basic" crops get price support at certain levels. They are corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco and peanuts. In 1950 they must be supported at 90 percent of parity. That is, the government must purchase them at a price equal to 90 percent of parity if the market price falls below that point. It is obligated to do so, however, only from farmers who are "cooperators"--those who agree to government-controlled acreage allotments or marketing quotas.[1]

---

[1] "What the Present Law Provides," Congressional Digest, Mar. 1950, p. 78.

In 1951 the support level will be determined by the secretary of agriculture, according to conditions, somewhere between 80 and 90 percent of parity. In 1952 and thereafter the level will be determined between a 75 and 90 percent range--except that support for tobacco is fixed at 90 percent where marketing quotas are in effect.

Where marketing quotas for basic crops are not approved by the farmers, support is mandatory at 50 percent of parity; however, higher supports may be given at the discretion of the secretary of agriculture.

For certain "non-basic" crops, such as wool, tung nuts, honey, milk and butter and their products, support also is mandatory. It is determined by the secretary of agriculture between 60 and 90 percent of parity for all these products except milk and butter and their by-products. For them the range is between 75 and 90 percent of parity.

All other agricultural commodities may be supported at not more than 90 percent of parity. This depends on the secretary of agriculture. He is to consider such factors as supply and demand, feed prices, availability of funds, perishability of the product, cooperation of the producers, importance of the products, and other factors. Any "storable" commodity for which marketing quotas are in effect is to receive support "so far as feasible."

Other major features of the act give the secretary of agriculture authority to condition eligibility of producers for price supports on compliance with acreage allotments, production goals and marketing practices.

If the secretary of agriculture determines, after a public hearing, that a parity price higher than 90 percent is necessary to prevent or alleviate a shortage of a commodity essential to the national welfare or to increase production of that commodity as a measure of national security, he may set a higher "parity" price.

Commodities purchased under the support program by the government may not be resold at less than 5 percent above the current support price--with few exceptions.

Perishable foods purchased under the law, if in danger of spoiling, may be given away by the government to any federal agency which can use them. Or they may be donated to school lunch programs, to public or private welfare organizations, within the United States, or to Federal Indian agencies.

Loans up to 80 percent of the cost may be advanced to cooperatives to build new storage facilities "in areas where privately owned storage is inadequate." These are subject to certain guarantees of use by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The above is only a sketchy account of the act. It does, however, provide a reasonable idea of the way the current price support law functions.

Farm newsmen will prefer to go to state or county Production Marketing offices to get local quotas and more recent interpretations of the regulations. With Korea developing a third war, it appears that the secretary of agriculture, under the present law, has powers to become czar of agriculture. The elastic clause tied to a national emergency can be used by the administration without approval of Congress. The President can and may declare a national emergency. The secretary of agriculture then would be empowered to pay prices he deems necessary for increasing production of any crop deemed necessary for the national welfare.

He is in a position to pay the farmer well for being loyal during an emergency.

The Research and Marketing Act

Passage of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 probably will be more

important, in the long run, than the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Long-range improvements of basic weaknesses in agriculture should come from the research and marketing act. It authorizes agricultural research at all stages of the marketing process from the farmer through the retail store.[1] It was backed with $9,500,000 in 1947 to $61,000,000 in 1951. It also authorized additional funds to agricultural experiment stations: $2,500,000 in 1947 to $20,000,000 in 1951.

A second appropriation was for research on utilization of agricultural products starting with $3,000,000 in 1947, and going to $20,000,000 in 1951.

A third appropriation started with $1,500,000 in 1947 and $6,000,000 available in 1950 for the United States Department of Agriculture to use in cooperation with state agricultural experiment stations. It was set up for such regional projects as breeding of livestock, weed control, developing safeguards so new, powerful insecticides might be used.

A fourth appropriation was to conduct marketing research and marketing services on an expanded scale. It was to go from $2,500,000 in 1947 to $20,000,000 in 1951.

Among other things to be expected from the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 is popularization of "consumer grades" for meats, poultry, eggs, butter, fresh and processed fruits and vegetables.[2]

To reduce handling charges, research was (and is being) carried on in market news, warehousing, transportation, interstate trade barriers, statistics and other marketing phases. An eleven-man advisory board provided for in the act is to see that the research is to benefit all people of the nation--producers and consumers alike.

---

[1] "What, Why, How?" Consumer's Guide April, 1947, p. 3-4.

[2] Ibid., p. 4.

Judging from the past, the money for research will be wisely spent. Research at the New Jersey experiment station discovered streptomycin which is more effective in treatment of some diseases than is penicillin or the sulfa drugs. The California station crossed cantaloupe varieties, eliminated powdery mildew, and saved the industry from extinction. The New York (Cornell) station, with artificial breeding studies, made possible the spread of good qualities of sires over entire herds throughout wide areas. The Kansas State College station discovered a vaccine for Blackleg disease of cattle.

Dr. Lambert, director of the Agricultural Research Administration, said agricultural research has given back to the nation about $100 for every dollar invested in it.[1]

It took $10,000,000 and thirty years research to make present-day hybrid corn possible. Dividend in 1946 alone, he said was $375,000,000. The United States Department of Agriculture has developed dozens of disease-resistant varieties of wheat, oats, barley, rye and other grains to add $500,000 to farm income each year. Cattle controlled for flies with DDT at Kansas State College gained 50 pounds more than those not controlled.[2] Controlled dairy cattle gave 10 to 15 percent more milk.

The drug, phenothiazine, now controls internal parasites. Casings of sheep had been used for surgical thread, but United States domestic sheep were so badly damaged by worms they could not be used--until stockmen began to use phenothiazine.

(An alert editor could have tied the sheep producer dramatically to battlefield hospitals with the story of sheep casings used for surgical

---

[1] W. V. Lambert, "Research Yields Billions," Science News Letter April 1947, p. 230.

[2] Ibid., p. 31.

thread and the fight against worms with phenothiazine.)

The task force of the committee for reorganization of the executive branch of the government recognized the importance of research--called it one of the most fundamental needs of the people who make their living from agriculture and those who obtain the essentials of living from agriculture.[1]

The entire population, both rural and urban, has a direct stake in agricultural research, the task force report stated.

> Information of incalculable value has come from research programs of the Department of Agriculture and from allied research agencies in the state experiment stations.
>
> Research must provide the new basic information essential to progress in other fields. Without research, agriculture could not long hold its present position, much less advance to meet the new and ever-changing conditions of modern civilization.
>
> The tremendous growth in agricultural productivity which marked the last century is almost entirely a product of research. A steady stream of new developments has poured forth from the laboratories and field plots of the United States Department of Agriculture and the state experiment stations.
>
> The pattern in agriculture is the same as in industry--the more research, the greater the productivity. Yet despite the increased productivity of American agriculture, the population continued to press hard upon agriculture to satisfy its needs and wants. The nation cannot afford to relax its agricultural research.
>
> The conclusion inescapable is that a sound, progressive, prosperous agriculture will require as great a proportionate investment in research as is made by our healthiest industries.[2]

TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THEORETICAL STUDY

After the above cursory survey of agriculture's history, the United States Department of Agriculture, agricultural economics, a look at agricultural statistics, farm organizations, a few technical words and agri-

---

[1] Task Force Report, op. cit., p. 24.

[2] Task Force Report, op. cit., p. 25.

cultural terms and politics with the voting of Congressmen, the writer has come to several conclusions. Because he skimmed only the surface, and perhaps did that none too competently, he realizes that the conclusions may be fallible.

Since both labor and management have codes of ethics and canons of journalism to follow, no new one need be written for the farm editor. If one were written for the farm editor, however, it could stress his obligations regarding the general welfare more. And it should emphasize the interdependence of all segments of society.

That United States extension adult educators are teaching some of the same things Cato and Varro wrote for their contemporaries to follow in management of farms in Rome Before Christ illustrated how slow a process education is, but the author has no recommendations to take the place of education. Agriculture, it was noted, made its greatest strides following laws passed in the United States Congress beginning in the 1860's.

Most important agricultural law ever written, in the author's mind, was the pre-emption law which established legally what had grown on the frontier of the United States: pre-emption and full free proprietorship. It seemed that there was a definite and positive correlation between the advancement of agriculture under free proprietorship compared with the slower progress made before men became full owners of the soil they tilled. Much more agricultural progress has been recorded since the 1860's than was recorded between than and Cato's time in ancient Rome.

It also was observed that agriculture was so important in the United States that the history of agriculture in the United States and the history of the United States are often the same thing.

Many of the stories now written by farm editors could be richly back-

grounded with historical events that led to the current news.

The study of the United States Department of Agriculture indicated that the department grew somewhat like Topsy, now has many overlapping (and sometimes contradictory) branches with fieldmen at the local level. Some of the best minds in contemporary America have studied the department as members of the task force on agriculture for the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the United States government. They made recommendations, included in the thesis proper, which the author cannot refute. That the department needs reorganization is known by every farmer who deals with it. Sixteen different groups reporting directly to the secretary is poor administration which probably lies at the base of most honest criticism of the department. The department offers duplicating services through different branches that vie with each other to do the same jobs, has too many field men. They confuse the public and destroy confidence in the department and its program. Most glaring example, perhaps, is in the credit field. Although field men for extension, soil conservation, the production and marketing administration, and perhaps others, are using different means to accomplish the same ends in many instances.

The short glance at statistics renewed that old wheeze about figures not lying, but liars figuring. If farm editors could get all their readers to remember that, according to the census definition, a farm is any tract of land, three acres or more in extent, upon which some farm operations are carried out; or any less acreage on which commodities valued at $250 are raised annually, many cases for and against different phases of farming would be destroyed. The thousands of farms in the smallest category, what they produce, how those who farm them live, et cetera used by statisticians (with a pre-determined effect desired) can make a strong case for higher subsidies

to the small farmer--or placing a higher premium on inefficiency in a proposed farm law.

The agricultural writer using statistics needs to define them. Otherwise, there should be some warning system for readers to let them know that the writer is building a case. Technically the writer could tell truth, but convey a false impression of huge proportions. Using the smallest 100,000 farms, one could "view with alarm" the agricultural situation at any given time. Switching to the 100,000 that produce the largest net income, one could show farmers spending winter months on sunny southern beaches with daughters driving Cadillacs at "finishing" schools.

The statistics in each story would be absolutely accurate. The impression left by either story would be highly false.

Farm programs studied in agricultural economics indicated that none so far has been based on a provable nor workable philosophy. The current philosophy that high wages for labor makes prosperity for farmers or vice versa takes into account only about six million workers in the world. It is rather obvious that world demand for and supply of money and goods determines the prosperity of both these segments now being wooed politically. The Farm Bureau's program is more realistic than that of the government. The Farm Bureau, however, obviously is a pressure group for only one segment of a very highly complicated and interdependent society.

The National Farmers Union's program is more sociological than agricultural. It is the voice of the smaller farmer and of minority groups in agriculture. It serves a useful purpose by throwing an exposing light on conditions that should not exist. But the programs it proposes are perhaps less sound economically than those of other farm organizations.

Most effectiveness of farm organizations has been similar to the

effectiveness of third parties in the political arena of the United States. Both get major parties to accept planks for the major party's platform.

These professional farm organizations, it appeared, are much more effective in getting farm legislation passed than are letters to Congressmen, votes, threats of negative votes and other methods of securing legislation in the national Congress. That the farmer is not now farming under the Brannan plan can be directly credited or blamed on the American Farm Bureau Federation. Brannan, forsaking precedent, did not consult farm bureau leaders before presenting his plan. Despite high political organization and grass roots meetings to form favorable sentiment for the plan, it went down in Congress. Basically, the plan was much more socialistic than are legislative proposals of the Farm Bureau, the largest farm organization and the one that best represents the wealthier farmers. Farmers also opposed Brannan's direct subsidy. Though no more real than price supports, the subsidies under the Brannan plan would have been much more apparent.

For that reason the author of this paper feels that the plan should have been given a trial on the few commodities the administration offered in its final compromise.

The study of votes in the two houses of the national legislature led the writer to several new found conclusions: The Senate is overjealous of its perogatives, or at least more so than the House of Representatives. Members of the Senate rejected Taft's amendment to reduce the $100,000,000 for school lunches to $57,500,000 only 50 to 21 in 1946. A year later the Senate voted 80 to 0 to insist on $75,000,000 rather than the $45,000,000 for school lunches provided in the House bill. Being the only continuous legislative body, they seem to hang on tradition and insist on recognition--even though it sometimes runs counter to the general welfare.

Such rules as not permitting a member to name another member in debate seem to prevent some outbursts, but they also tend to waste much time. Speeches delivered before votes are cast--and frequently after voting--indicate that members of both Houses talk more to the people at home than to influence the voting in Congress.

Particularly is this true of speeches entered in the Congressional Record but not delivered on the floor of Congress. This practice often is criticized during discussions (and in newspaper and periodical articles) on cutting expenses in the government. Since those who frank their speeches to their constituents pay for the printing of the speeches, there is some merit in permitting them to use this method of reporting to the people they represent.

That subversive elements have paid the printing charges and used the franking privilege to send out speeches of Congressmen--speeches they helped write--shows the privilege should carry enforceable responsiblities with it. But this strikes at Congressional immunity, which has no place in this paper.

If one recalls the programs on which the votes are recorded, it is apparent that the votes cast in Congress are bids for support. Decisions are made in pre-voting maneuvering. The die was quite well cast in most cases before the vote was taken.

We hear much of the farm bloc, but Congressmen casting votes, with few exceptions, do not vote as a farm bloc. They forsake the so-called bloc and vote on almost pure political lines many times. Prejudices of the South and those of business over labor are stronger than loyalties to farmers as the free school lunch program vote indicated, when one studies those who cast votes against it.

If there is a farm bloc, it is not dangerous. The vote to prohibit

procurement of agricultural products outside the United States was defeated in the Senate nine months before Pearl Harbor. What senators thought was the general welfare of the United States obviously cut through the so-called farm bloc. It is well that it did. So the farm bloc on votes recorded does not appear strong enough to damage the welfare of other segments of society.

Farm programs, it also was noticed, do not come from the country. They are from the administration, through Congress, to the country.

The administration, in most cases, had drawn up the program, got as much as it could approved in Congress and took it to the farmer. The fact that local suffrage determines whether or not certain farm programs will be accepted locally seems to be more democratic than the voting done in the halls of Congress in Washington.

That a Congressman's vote is a bid for support is best shown by Henry Cabot Lodge's (Mass.) voting on the Housing Act in 1938. He submitted the amendment known as the prevailing-wage amendment, favored by labor. He was highly praised by labor for the amendment. Then he voted against the bill. Perhaps his ruse would not have been noticed had he not inserted letters of commendation from both labor leaders and conservative constituents in the Congressional Record--the same day.

Studying the Congressional Record (and the Congressional Directory to get party affiliations and first names of those who voted) gave many indications that Congress no longer has much to do with agricultural laws. Congress instead is a check on the bureaucracy which formulates the programs and tries to get them accepted.

It seems to the writer that Congress should be reorganized so it could use the talents of its many lawyers and agricultural leaders to formulate its own laws. Perhaps this could be done through standing committees that

choose members not from seniority but for their special knowledge.

It appeared to the writer that agriculture could best get its representation in the future through the voting the department of agriculture conducts on a local level. As the country becomes more specialized, no Congressman can represent all persons in his district. And it would be even more difficult for a senator to represent all persons in a state.

The segments of society that are crying for representation (special favors) transcend the geographical boundaries of a state or district.

Farmers of Washington and those of Kansas raising wheat have more in common than farmers in Washington have with the shipyard workers in Bremerton.

This writer would not disturb the geographical representation we have--even though Nevada and New York both have two senators. It seemed, however, from the study that farm representatives getting together with representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture to formulate laws later to be presented to Congress for approval would give the farmer better representation than he can expect to maintain as his numbers, percentage wise, continue to decrease in each succeeding census.

Life magazine and the New Republic recently reported that realists in the United States Department of Agriculture think 3,800,000 of the 5,800,000 farmers are marginal or sub-marginal. The realists would like to see about half this marginal population move to cities.[1]

Few radio executives cannot name members of the Federal Communications Commission. That is where they get their representation in Washington. Truckline and railroad executives undoubtedly know nearly every member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They may not know their representatives and

---

[1] Angus McDonald, "Henry Luce and the Farmer," New Republic May 26, 1947, p. 31.

senators. But they get representation in Washington by going to Washington themselves.

So long as the Department of Agriculture continues to conduct local elections, farmers will have a way of making their word heard in Washington. Let them hope the strings attached to a "yea" vote do not strangle "nay" votes. The fear of lowered prices is a compelling influence for affirmative votes. Each time a farmer votes "yea" for a subsidy, he accepts an accompanying control. Is he trading liberty for false security? That is a question he must decide. The facts for making the decision should be furnished by his farm editor.

Furnishing the farmer information from which he bases decisions at the ballot box gives the farm editor a dual responsibility. He must tell farmers and their city cousins about the broader policies, the politics, economics and social significance of what is going on in Washington, in his state and in his county. In addition he must make the news <u>important to</u> the <u>farmer</u> and to his <u>city cousins</u>.

SOURCES USED TO OBTAIN OPINIONS OF WORKING FARM EDITORS

List of Farm Newspaper Editors Who Received Questionnaire, Alphabetized by States

Farm Editor
Anniston Star
Anniston, Alabama

Clarence Poe, Editor
Progressive Farmer
Birmingham, Alabama

L. O. Brackeen, Farm Editor
Birmingham News-Age-Herald
Birmingham, Alabana

Farm Editor
Birmingham Post
Birmingham, Alabama

H. M. Layman, Farm Editor
Decatur Daily
Decatur, Alabama

Farm Editor
Dothan Eagle
Dothan, Alabama

Jo E. McDonald, Farm Editor
Gadsen Times
Gadsen, Alabama

Autry Greer, Farm Editor
Press-Register
Mobile, Alabama

Herve Charest, Jr., Editor
Alabama Farm Bureau News
Montgomery, Alabama

Farm Editor
Montgomery Advertiser
Montgomery, Alabama

Farm Editor
Arizona Republic
Phoenix, Arizona

Louis A. Witzeman, Farm Editor
Times
Phoenix, Arizona

Farm Editor
Arizona Daily Star
Tuscon, Arizona

Farm Editor
Southwest American
Fort Smith, Arkansas

Farm Editor
Arkansas Gazette
Little Rock, Arkansas

Stanley Andrews, Editor
Arkansas Democrat
Little Rock, Arkansas

Farm Editor
Gazette
Texarkana, Arkansas

Farm Editor
Gazette
Berkeley, California

Farm Editor
Record
Berkeley, California

Farm Editor
Fresno Bee
Fresno, California

Farm Editor
News-Press
Glendale, California

Farm Editor
Times-Mirror
Los Angeles, California

Farm Editor
Herald-Express
Los Angeles, California

Farm Editor
Examiner
Los Angeles, California

Farm Editor
Press-Telegram
Long Beach, California

Farm Editor
Tribune
Oakland, California

Farm Editor
Star-News
Pasadena, California

Robert Emerson, Farm Editor
Sacramento Bee
Sacramento, California

Farm Editor
Union-Tribune
San Diego, California

Farm Editor
Pacific Rural Press & California Farmer
San Francisco, California

Vernon O'Reilley, Farm Editor
News
San Francisco, California

Farm Editor
Call-Bulletin
San Francisco, California

Farm Editor
Chronicle
San Francisco, California

Farm Editor
The Denver Post
Denver, Colorado

Robert Perkin, Farm Editor
The Rocky Mountain News
Denver, Colorado

Farm Editor
Express Courier
Fort Collins, Colorado

Farm Editor
Tribune-Republican
Greeley, Colorado

Farm Editor
Star-Journal
Pueblo, Colorado

Harold Waldo, Farm Editor
Times
Hartford, Connecticut

H. M. Briggs, Farm Editor
Norwich Bulletin-Record
Norwich, Connecticut

Farm Editor
Wilmington Morning News
Wilmington, Delaware

Farm Editor
Wilmington Journal-Every-Evening
Wilmington, Delaware

James Birchfield, Farm Editor
Star
Washington, D. C.

Glen M. Hearin, Farm Editor
Times-Herald
Washington, D. C.

Farm Editor
Washington Daily News
Washington, D. C.

Farm Editor
Washington Post
Washington, D. C.

Jim Camp, Farm Editor
Sun
Gainsville, Florida

Nixon Smiley, Farm Editor
Miami Herald, All-Florida Section
Miami, Florida

William H. Bischoff, Farm Editor
News
Miami, Florida

Wilton Plumb, Farm Editor
Tribune
Tampa, Florida

Farm Editor
Albany Herald
Albany, Georgia

Farm Editor
Atlanta Journal
Atlanta, Georgia

Channing Cope, Farm Editor
The Atlanta Constitution
Atlanta, Georgia

Farm Editor
Columbus Enquirer
Columbus, Georgia

Doug Boswell
Farm Editor
Hilo, Hawaii

Farm Editor
Idaho Daily Statesman
Boise, Idaho

Farm Editor
The Post Register
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Doyle Nolen, Farm Editor
Tribune
Lewiston, Idaho

L. A. Boas
Idahonian
Moscow, Idaho

Farm Editor
The News
Twin Falls, Idaho

Frank Bill, Farm Editor
Pantagraph
Bloomington, Illinois

Farm Editor
Chicago Daily News
Chicago, Illinois

Gail Compton, Farm Editor
Tribune
Chicago, Illinois

Farm Editor
Sun
Chicago, Illinois

Clifford Lant, Farm Editor
The Dispatch
Moline, Illinois

John Wenke, Farm Editor
Journal
Peoria, Illinois

Dolores Reilly, Farm Editor
The Argus
Rock Island, Illinois

Farm Editor
Journal-Register
Springfield, Illinois

Lynn Ruester, Farm Editor
Evening Courier
Urbana, Illinois

George Rinehart, Farm Editor
The News-Sun
Waukegan, Illinois

Farm Editor
Elkhart Truth
Elkhart, Indiana

Charles Stone, Farm Editor
Courier
Evansville, Indiana

Wesley E. Bashore, Farm Editor
Journal-Gazette
Fort Wayne, Indiana

Herb Swartz, Farm Editor
News-Democrat
Goshen, Indiana

Robert Kellum
Star
Indianapolis, Indiana

Frank Zalzarulo, Farm Editor
News
Indianapolis, Indiana

Farm Editor
Courier-Times
New Castle, Indiana

Farm Editor
Palladium-Item
Richmond, Indiana

Phillip Combs, Farm Editor
Tribune
South Bend, Indiana

Ray Anderson, Farm Editor
Cedar Rapids Gazette
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Farm Editor
Nonpareil
Council Bluffs, Iowa

Franz Krause, Farm Editor
Times
Davenport, Iowa

J. S. Russell, Farm Editor
Des Moines Register & Tribune
Des Moines, Iowa

Joe Mattes, Farm Editor
Telegraph-Herald
Dubuque, Iowa

Farm Editor
Mason City Globe-Gazette
Mason City, Iowa

Marcella Cox
Farm Editor
Sioux City, Iowa

Robert Bliss, Farm Editor
Courier
Waterloo, Iowa

Farm Editor
Arkansas Daily Traveler
Arkansas City, Kansas

James Orton, Farm Editor
Coffeyville Journal
Coffeyville, Kansas

Farm Editor
Dodge City Globe
Dodge City, Kansas

Farm Editor
Farm Journal
Dodge City, Kansas

T. F. McDaniels, Farm Editor
Emporia Gazette
Emporia, Kansas

Bill Bork, Farm Editor
Hutchinson News-Herald
Hutchinson, Kansas

Dick Hardy, Farm Editor
Reporter
Independence, Kansas

Farm Editor
Iola Register
Iola, Kansas

Farm Editor
McPherson Daily Republican
McPherson, Kansas

Farm Editor
Mercury-Chronicle
Manhattan, Kansas

John Ellison, Farm Editor
Parsons Sun
Parsons, Kansas

Farm Editor
Salina Journal
Salina, Kansas

Glen Tabor, Farm Editor
Topeka Daily Capital
Topeka, Kansas

Marvin Levand, Farm Editor
Wichita Beacon
Wichita, Kansas

Bruce Behymer, Farm Editor
Wichita Eagle
Wichita, Kansas

Zan Oberwarth, Farm Editor
State Journal
Frankfort, Kentucky

Farm Editor
Lexington Herald
Lexington, Kentucky

Farm Editor
Louisville Courier-Journal
Louisville, Kentucky

Adras Laborde, Farm Editor
Alexandria Town Talk
Alexandria, Louisiana

Farm Editor
American Press
Lake Charles, Louisiana

Farm Editor
The Monroe News-Star
Monroe, Louisiana

R. W. Hartshorn, Farm Editor
Times-Picayune
New Orleans, Louisiana

Farm Editor
Shreveport Times
Shreveport, Louisiana

Farm Editor
Lewiston Daily Sun and Evening Journal
Lewiston, Maine

Frank Lovering, Farm Editor
Press-Herald, Express, Telegram
Portland, Maine

Dorothy Dunbar, Farm Editor
Capital
Annapolis, Maryland

Farm Editor
Baltimore Sun
Baltimore, Maryland

Farm Editor
Frederick Post
Frederick, Maryland

Farm Editor
Boston Globe
Boston, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
Boston Post
Boston, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
Herald-News
Fall River, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
Greenfield Recorder-Gazette
Greenfield, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
Hyannis Patriot
Hyannis, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
Eagle-Tribune
Lawrence, Massachusetts

B. L. Pouzzner, Farm Editor
Sunday Telegram
Lowell, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
ITEM
Lynn, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
Hampshire Gazette
Northampton, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
Berkshire Eagle
Pittsfield, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
Patriot-Ledger
Quincy, Massachusetts

Farm Editor
Springfield Union and Republican
Springfield, Massachusetts

David Reft, Farm Editor
Ann Arbor News
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Charles E. Johnson, Farm Editor
The Bay City Times
Bay City, Michigan

Robert DeWolfe, Farm Editor
Detroit Free Press
Detroit, Michigan

G. H. Bastien, Farm Editor
Flint Journal
Flint, Michigan

D. L. Runnells, Farm Editor
Grand Rapids Press
Grand Rapids, Michigan

James Fleming, Farm Editor
Jackson Citizen-Patriot
Jackson, Michigan

Jack L. Crittenden, Farm Editor
Kalamazoo Gazette
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Carlisle Carver, Farm Editor
State Journal
Lansing, Michigan

J. A. Chisholm, Farm Editor
The Muskegon Chronicle
Muskegon, Michigan

Farm Editor
The Saginaw News
Saginaw, Michigan

Farm Editor
Traverse City Record-Eagle
Traverse City, Michigan

Farm Editor
Herald-News-Tribune
Duluth, Minnesota

Russell Asleson, Farm Editor
Star Tribune
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alfred D. Stedman, Farm Editor
Dispatch-Pioneer Press
St. Paul, Minnesota

Farm Editor
Columbus Dispatch
Columbus, Mississippi

Farm Editor
Daily Clarion Ledger
Jackson, Mississippi

James Ewing, Farm Editor
Jackson Daily News
Jackson, Mississippi

Farm Editor
McComb Enterprise
McComb, Mississippi

C. J. Carey, Farm Editor
Courier-Post
Hannibal, Missouri

Farm Editor
Capital-News
Jefferson City, Missouri

Farm Editor
Star
Kansas City, Missouri

Farm Editor
Capital-Democrat
Sedalia, Missouri

Richard Altman, Farm Editor
News-Press Gazette
St. Joseph, Missouri

Farm Editor
Star-Telegram
St. Louis, Missouri

Farm Editor
St. Louis Post-Dispatch
St. Louis, Missouri

Farm Editor
The Gazette
Billings, Montana

Farm Editor
Standard-Post
Butte, Montana

Farm Editor
The Great Falls Tribune
Great Falls, Montana

Farm Editor
Record-Herald
Helena, Montana

Farm Editor
Democrat-News
Lewistown, Montana

Farm Editor
Miles City Star
Miles City, Montana

Farm Editor
The Missoulian
Missoula, Montana

Graham Howe, Farm Editor
Fremont Guide and Tribune
Fremont, Nebraska

C. L. (Chick) Hartley, Farm Editor
Grand Island Independent
Grand Island, Nebraska

Cal Orr, Farm Editor
Hastings Daily Tribune
Hastings, Nebraska

Farm Editor
Star-Journal
Lincoln, Nebraska

Carlyle Hodgkin or Dallas Coffin
Farm Editor
Omaha World-Herald
Omaha, Nebraska

Marvin E. Carter
News
Boulder City, Nevada

Farm Editor
Nevada State Journal
Reno, Nevada

Farm Editor
Claremont Eagle
Claremont, New Hampshire

Farm Editor
Keene Sentinel
Keene, New Hampshire

Raymond Smith, Farm Editor
Laconia Citizen
Laconia, New Hampshire

Fred E. Beane, Farm Editor
Manchester,
Manchester, New Hampshire

Farm Editor
Atlantic City Daily Press
Atlantic City, New Jersey

Farm Editor
Times
Bayonne, New Jersey

Farm Editor
Elizabeth Daily Journal
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Farm Editor
Bergen Evening Record
Hackensack, New Jersey

Curtis Schick, Farm Editor
Newark Evening News
Newark, New Jersey

Allen Mitchell, Farm Editor
Paterson Sunday Eagle
Paterson, New Jersey

Farm Editor
Trenton State Gazette
Trenton, New Jersey

Wayne Scott, Farm Editor
Journal
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Doyle Kline, Farm Editor
Tribune
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Jack Gotshall, Farm Editor
Sun News
Las Cruces, New Mexico

George Gilmore, Farm Editor
Record
Rosewell, New Mexico

Charles Rundell, Farm Editor
Times-Union
Albany, New York

Gerrit P. Rogers, Farm Editor
Press
Binghamton, New York

LeRoy E. Fess, Farm Editor
Courier-Express
Buffalo, New York

Farm Editor
Elmira Star Gazette
Elmira, New York

Farm Editor
Glens Falls Star
Glens Falls, New York

Edward Curren, Farm Editor
Times-Herald
Middletown, New York

Farm Editor
Daily News
New York City, New York

Farm Editor
Journal & American
New York City, New York

Farm Editor
Mirror
New York City, New York

Farm Editor
New York Times
New York City, New York

Farm Editor
World Telegram
New York City, New York

Victor A. Albert, Farm Editor
Gazette
Niagara Falls, New York

L. B. Skeffington, Farm Editor
Democrat Chronicle
Rochester, New York

Farm Editor
Gazette
Schenectady, New York

Roy E. Fairman, Farm Editor
Herald-American
Syracuse, New York

James Doyle, Farm Editor
Observer-Dispatch
Utica, New York

Emlyn Evans, Farm Editor
Press
Utica, New York

Archie Willis, Farm Editor
News
Charlotte, North Carolina

Walter Carroll, Farm Editor
Herald & Sun
Durham, North Carolina

Harry Dickins, Farm Editor
Journal and Sentinel
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Farm Editor
Beacon-Journal
Akron, Ohio

Farm Editor
Repository
Canton, Ohio

Charles Durrett, Farm Editor
Enquirer
Cincinnati, Ohio

Robert A. Linn, Farm Editor
Post
Cincinnati, Ohio

Ellis Rawnsley, Farm Editor
Times-Star
Cincinnati, Ohio

Maxwell Riddle, Farm Editor
Cleveland Press
Cleveland, Ohio

James C. Davis, Farm Editor
Plaindealer
Cleveland, Ohio

Farm Editor
State Journal
Columbus, Ohio

Jesse Garrison, Farm Editor
Dayton News
Dayton, Ohio

Marian Esterline, Farm Editor
Journal
Dayton, Ohio

James Metcalf, Farm Editor
Blade
Toledo, Ohio

Arnold Fausz, Farm Editor
Times
Toledo, Ohio

C. J. Colmery, Farm Editor
Vindicator
Youngstown, Ohio

Forrest Warren, Farm Editor
News & Eagle
Enid, Oklahoma

Farm Editor
Daily Oklahoman
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Clarence Mantooth, Farm Editor
Tulsa World
Tulsa, Oklahoma

T. M. Bradley, Farm Editor
Gazette-Times
Corvallis, Oregon

Lowell L. L. Brandel, Farm Editor
Cushing Citizen
Cushing, Oregon

Robert Holley, Farm Editor
Journal
Portland, Oregon

Don Woodman, Farm Editor
Oregonian
Portland, Oregon

Lillie Larson, Farm Editor
Oregon Statesman
Salem, Oregon

George Geiger, Farm Editor
Call-Chronicle
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Farm Editor
Mirror
Altoona, Pennsylvania

Walter Jack, Farm Editor
Times
Erie, Pennsylvania

Farm Editor
News-Patriot
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Farm Editor
The Bulletin
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Farm Editor
The Press
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Farm Editor
The Eagle
Reading, Pennsylvania

Farm Editor
Tribune
Scranton, Pennsylvania

Farm Editor
Record
Milkes-Barr, Pennsylvania

Farm Editor
News
Newport, Rhode Island

Farm Editor
Bulletin
Providence, Rhode Island

Leonard O. Warner, Farm Editor
Journal
Providence, Rhode Island

J. Blessing, Farm Editor
Independent & Mail
Anderson, South Carolina

Farm Editor
News & Courier
Charleston, South Carolina

Farm Editor
Record
Columbia, South Carolina

Rodney Kreger, Farm Editor
American-News
Aberdeen, South Dakota

Jim Kuehn
Daily Journal
Rapid City, South Dakota

Ralph Hillgren, Farm Editor
Argus Leader
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Margaret Delaney, Farm Editor
Public Opinion
Watertown, South Dakota

Mouzon Peters, Farm Editor
Times
Chattanooga, Tennessee

Walter Durham, Farm Editor
Commercial Appeal
Memphis, Tennessee

Tom Meanley, Farm Editor
Press-Scimitar
Memphis, Tennessee

Phil Sullivan, Farm Editor
Tennessean
Nashville, Tennessee

David Rasco, Farm Editor
News-Globe
Amarillo, Texas

Billy McCarroll, Farm Editor
Times
Amarillo, Texas

William Galloway, Farm Editor
American Statesman
Austin, Texas

Roy Roddy, Farm Editor
News
Dallas, Texas

Ross Fitzgerald, Farm Editor
Times-Herald
Dallas, Texas

Russ Chappell, Farm Editor
Herald-Post
El Paso, Texas

Bill Durham, Farm Editor
Press
Fort Worth, Texas

Leon Hale, Farm Editor
Post
Houston, Texas

James Carroll, Farm Editor
Press
Houston, Texas

Spencer Richards, Farm Editor
Standard-Examiner
Ogden, Utah

Farm Editor
Desert News
Salt Lake City, Utah

Farm Editor
Tribune
Salt Lake City, Utah

R. A. Tottamini, Farm Editor
Barre Times
Barre, Vermont

Gertrude P. Langlais, Farm Editor
Burlington News
Burlington, Vermont

Farm Editor
Herald
Rutland, Vermont

Lowell Smith, Farm Editor
St. Johnsbury Caledonian-Record
St. Johnsbury, Vermont

James P. McKnight, Farm Editor
Free Lance Star
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Farm Editor
Virginian-Pilot
Norfolk, Virginia

John Leard, Farm Editor
News Leader
Richmond, Virginia

Farm Editor
Times
Seattle, Washington

Farm Editor
Chronicle
Spokane, Washington

Farm Editor
Spokesman-Review
Spokane, Washington

Paul Sandegren, Farm Editor
Times
Tacoma, Washington

Jack Ostergren, Farm Editor
Vancouver Columbian
Vancouver, Washington

A. W. Nelson, Farm Editor
Union-Bulletin
Walla Walla, Washington

Farm Editor
Gazette
Charleston, West Virginia

Farm Editor
Mail
Charleston, West Virginia

Farm Editor
Herald-Advertiser-Dispatch
Huntington, West Virginia

Robert T. Beans, Farm Editor
Intelligencer
Wheeling, West Virginia

Edgar P. Mercer, Farm Editor
Wisconsin State Journal
Madison, Wisconsin

Lewis C. French, Farm Editor
Milwaukee Journal
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Everett Swingle, Farm Editor
Milwaukee Sentinel
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Farm Editor
Bulletin-Journal-Times
Racine, Wisconsin

List of Farm Radio Editors Who Received Questionnaire, Alphabetized by States

Farm Editor, KOA
1624 California Street
Denver, Colorado

Farm Editor, KGHF
Pueblo Saving and Trust Building
Pueblo, Colorado

Farm Editor, KGEM
Oywhee Hotel
Boise, Idaho

Farm Editor, WBBM
410 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

Farm Editor, WCFL
666 Lake Shore Drive
Chicago, Illinois

Farm Editor, WLS
1230 Washington Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois

Farm Editor, WIBC
30 W. Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana

Farm Editor, WHO
407 Fifth Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa

Farm Editor, KMA
May Broadcasting Company
Shenandoah, Iowa

Farm Editor, KXEL
Insurance Building
Waterloo, Iowa

Farm Editor, KGNO
Cooper Hotel
Dodge City, Kansas

Farm Editor, KWHK
13 West 5th Street
Hutchinson, Kansas

Farm Editor, KOAM
Commerce Building
Pittsburg, Kansas

Farm Editor, WIBW
1035 Topeka Blvd.
Topeka, Kansas

Farm Editor, KFBI
200 E. First
Wichita, Kansas

Farm Editor, KFH
KFH Building
Wichita, Kansas

Farm Editor, WJR
Fisher Building
Detroit, Michigan

Farm Editor, KSTP
3415 University Avenue, S. E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Farm Editor, WCCO
625 Second Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Farm Editor, WGOY
Hotel Nicollet
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Farm Editor, KSFB
1025 Main
Joplin, Missouri

Farm Editor, KCMO
1515 Commerce Building
Kansas City, Missouri

Farm Editor, KMBC
Pickwick Hotel
Kansas City, Missouri

Farm Editor, WDAF
1229 Grand
Kansas City, Missouri

Farm Editor, WHB
Scarritt Building
St. Joseph, Missouri

Farm Editor, KMOX
401 South 12th
St. Louis, Missouri

Farm Editor, KXOK
12th and Delmar
St. Louis, Missouri

Farm Editor, KOOK
124 North 27th
Billings, Montana

Farm Editor, KXLF
Box 1956
Butte, Montana

Farm Editor, KMON
Tribune Building
Great Falls, Montana

Farm Editor, KGVA
132 West Front
Missoula, Montana

Farm Editor, KMMJ
Cedar at Division
Grand Island, Nebraska

Farm Editor, KFOR
Stuart Building
Lincoln, Nebraska

Farm Editor, KFAB
260 Farnam
Omaha, Nebraska

Farm Editor, WOW
Insurance Building
Omaha, Nebraska

Farm Editor, KOLT
1517½ Broadway
Scottsbluff, Nebraska

Farm Editor, KOB
Fifth and Silver
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Farm Editor, KFYR
419 North Syracuse
Bismarck, North Dakota

Farm Editor, KFGO
KFGO Building
Fargo, North Dakota

Farm Editor, WDAY
Block Building
Fargo, North Dakota

Farm Editor, WTAM
815 Superior
Cleveland, Ohio

Farm Editor, KOMA
Biltmore Hotel
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Farm Editor, KMRG
4th and Denver
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Farm Editor, KVOO
2104 Philtower
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Farm Editor, KOAC
Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon

Farm Editor, KEX
1230 S. W. Main
Portland, Oregon

Farm Editor, KOTA
Alex Johnson Hotel
Rapid City, South Dakota

Farm Editor, KELO
8th and Phillips
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Farm Editor, WNAX
2nd and Capitol
Yankton, South Dakota

Farm Editor, KGNC
8th and Harrison
Amarillo, Texas

Farm Editor, WFAA
1122 Jackson
Dallas, Texas

Farm Editor, WBAP
3900 Barnett
Fort Worth, Texas

Farm Editor, KABC
Milam Building
San Antonio, Texas

Farm Editor, WOAI
Box 2641
San Antonio, Texas

Farm Editor, KSL
Union Pacific Building
Salt Lake City, Utah

Farm Editor, KFBC
Plains Hotel
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Farm Editor, WEAU
203 South Barstow
Eau Claire, Wisconsin

Farm Editor, WBAY
Bellin Building
Green Bay, Wisconsin

Farm Editor, WKBH
409 South Main
LaCrosse, Wisconsin

Farm Editor, WHA
University of Wisconsin
Radio Hall
Madison, Wisconsin

Farm Editor, WIBA
3800 Regent
Madison, Wisconsin

Farm Editor, WKOW
215 W. Washington
Madison, Wisconsin

Farm Editor, WISN
540 North Plankinton
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Kansas State College
Manhattan

Technical Journalism

The Questionnaire

September 29, 1950

Dear Farm Editor:

We are both working for the farmer. You can help me do a better job.

You are doing what I am trying to teach students to do--gather, interpret and edit farm news. I am to teach a course here called "The Farm Page."

I'd like to know some of the things you'd like to tell a future assistant about gathering, editing and interpreting farm news.

What would you like to have him study before he came to your newspaper?

What do you think of the attached curriculum in agricultural journalism?

What books should the farm editor have for reference?

What and who are the best sources for tips?

How important is it that he be able to handle a camera? Develop and print negatives?

Is a farm background and sincere love of the land an absolute prerequisite?

Is is more important for the student to get technical agricultural courses (as Elements of Animal Husbandry) or a broad general background in writing, history, economics and literature, including grammar and spelling?

What criticism do you have of students the journalism schools and departments now are turning out?

Answering the above questions will be a big help. I hope you also have time to look over the attached agricultural journalism curriculum to tell us where it is weak, where strong. Your suggestions in blanks provided for "other references" on the second enclosure will be used for a guide in assigning collateral reading outside the text.

In fact, all your responses will be used in the classroom next semester and in a thesis I'm preparing for partial requirements for a master's degree.

I cannot give you results quickly. However, I'll send at least an abstract to you if you request it.

Sincerely,

Lowell Brandner

LOWELL BRANDNER
Ass't Professor in
Technical Journalism

CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL JOURNALISM

Freshman

First Semester		Second Semester	
Course	Sem. Hrs.	Course	Sem. Hrs.
Written Comm. I	3	Written Com. II	2
Biol. In Rel. to Man I	4	Biol. In Rel. To Man II	4
Man's Phys. World I	4	Man's Phys. World II	4
El. Of An. Husb.	3	El. Of Dairying	3
Military 1A	1	El. Of Hort.	3
		Military IB	1
Total	15	Total	17

Sophomore

Course	Sem. Hrs.	Course	Sem. Hrs.
Oral comm.	2	Prin. of Feeding	3
Man and Soc. World I	4	Man and Soc. World II	4
Soils	4	Farm Machinery	3
Farm Poul. Prod.	3	Reporting II	3
Agr. Journalism	3	Gen. Econ. Entomology	3
Miliatary	1	Military	1
Total	17	Total	16

Junior

Course	Sem. Hrs.	Course	Sem. Hrs.
Economics I	3	Farm Organization	3
Farm Crops	4	Mktg. Farm Prod.	3
Magazine Article Writing	2	News Photography	2
Prin. Of Advertising	3	Radio News	2 or
English Proficiency	R	Rural Press	2
Elective*	4	Editing	2
		Elective*	4
Total	16	Total	16

Senior

Course	Sem. Hrs.	Course	Sem. Hrs.
Man and Cult. World I	4	Man and Cult. World II	4
Jour. In a Free Soc.	3	Interp. Of Contemp. Aff.	3
Plant Pathology I	3	Elective*	9
Elective*	6		
Total	16	Total	16

Number of hours required for graduation, 130.

_ _ _ \

On this list to help a farm editor background and interpret farm news I am most interested in your suggestions in the blanks labeled "others." If you have time, you could help me guide students to the Better references by checking "Good," "Fair," or "Poor" to the left of each, publication.

Good Fair Poor

I. AGRONOMY

1. Soils

G_ F_ P_ A. "The Nature and Properties of Soils" by T. Lyttleton Lyon and Harry O. Buckman.

G_ F_ P_ B. "Fundamentals of Soil Science" by Charles E. Millar and L. M. Turk.

G_ F_ P_ C. "Soils and You," Yearbook of Agriculture, 1938.

D. Others

---

2. Crops

G_ F_ P_ A. "Principles of Field Crop Production" by John H. Martin and Warren H. Leonard.

G_ F_ P_ B. "Field Crops" by Howard C. Rather.

C. Others

II. ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

G_ F_ P_ A. "Feeds and Feeding" by Frank B. Morrison.

G_ F_ P_ B. "Types and Market Classes of Livestock" by Henry W. Vaughn.

G_ F_ P_ C. "Keeping Livestock Healthy," Yearbook of Agri., 1942.

G_ F_ P_ D. "Animal Science" by M. E. Ensminger.

E. Others

III. DAIRY HUSBANDRY

G_ F_P_ A. "Dairy Science, Its Principles and Practice" by William E. Peterson.

B. Others

IV. ENTOMOLOGY

G_ F_ P_ A. "Destructive and Useful Insects, Their Habits and Control" by Clell L. Metcalf and W.P. Flint, 2d ed.

G_ F_ P_ B. Announcements and Bulletins from Fed. Bur. of Entomol

G_ F_ P_ C. Announcements and Bulletins of State Agr. Expt. Sta.

D. Others

V. HORTICULTURE

G_ F_ P_ A. "Diseases and Pests of Ornamental Trees" by Bernard O. Dodge and Harved W. Pickett.

G_ F_ P_ B. "Maintenance of Shade and Ornamental Trees" by P. P. Pirone.

G_ F_ P_ C. "Cyclopedia of American Horticulture" by Liberty H. Bailey, 4th ed.

G_ F_ P_ D. "The Garden Dictionary" by Norman Taylor.

E. Others

Good Fair Poor

VI. PLANT PATHOLOGY

G__ F__ P__ A Nature and Prevention of Plant Diseases" by Kenneth S. Chester, 2d ed.
G__ F__ P__ B "Diseases of Field Crops: by James G. Dickson.
G__ F__ P__ C. "Elements of Plant Pathology" by Irving E. Melhus and George C. Kent.
G__ F__ P__ D Others

VII. POULTRY HUSBANDRY

G__ F__ P__ A "Successful Poultry Management" by Morely A. Jull.
G__ F__ P__ B "Poultry Production" by William A. Lippincott and Leslie E. Card.
G__ F__ P__ C "Diseases and Parasites of Poultry" by Edgar H. Barger and Leslie E. Card.
G__ F__ P__ D Others

VIII. AGRICULTURE IN THE AMERIAN ECONOMY

G__ F__ P__ A "Readings in the Economic History of American Agriculture" by Louis B. Schmidt and Earle Dudley Ross.
G__ F__ P__ B "Elements of Agricultural Economics" by G.A. Forster and Marc Leager.
G__ F__ P__ C "America's Economic Growth" by Fred Albert Shannon.
G__ F__ P__ D "Farmers in a Changing World," Yearbook of Agr., 1940
G__ F__ P__ E "Agricultural Economics" by Benjamin H. Hibbard.
G__ F__ P__ F "The Granger Movement" by Solon Justus Black.
G__ F__ P__ G "Selected Readings in Rural Economics" by Thomas Carver.
G__ F__ P__ H "The Populist Revolt, a History of the Farmers' Alliance and the Peoples' Party" by John D. Hicks.
G__ F__ P__ I "The Farm Block" by Weasley McCune.
G__ F__ P__ J Others

IX. AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

G__ F__ P__ A "History of Agriculture in the Northern United States" by Percy Wells Bidwell and John I. Faulcone
G__ F__ P__ B "History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to1860" by Lewis Cecil Gray assisted by Esther Katherine Thompson.
G__ F__ P__ C "A History of Agricultural Experimentation and Research in the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture" by Alfred Charles True.
G__ F__ P__ D "A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States" by Alfred Charles True.
G__ F__ P__ E "A History of Agriculture in Europe and America" by Norman Scott Brien Gras.
G__ F__ P__ F Others

X. NUTRITION

G__ F__ P__ A "Final Rep. of the Mixed Comm. Of the League of Nations on the Relation of Nutrition to
G__ F__ P__ Health, Agriculture and Economic Policy."
G__ F__ P__ B FAO (United Nations Food and Agr. Org.) Reports.
G__ F__ P__ C Others

I hope you still have time to check the ones of these that you use or know are good.

Aberdeen-Angus Journal, Webster City, Ia.

Agricultural News Letter, E. I. DuPont deNemours and Co., Inc., Wilmington 98, Delaware.

American Cyanagrams, American Cyanamid Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y.

American Farm Bureau Federation Official News Letter, 221 N. LaSalle St., Chicago.

American Hereford Journal, 600 Graphic Arts Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.

Better Crops with Plant Food, 1115 16th St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Better Farming Methods, Watt Publishing Co., Mount Morris, Ill.

The Business of Farming, U. S. Gypsum Co., 300 West Adams St., Chicago 6, Ill.

Cargill Crop Bulletin, 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

Certified Milk, 1226 Broadway, New York 1, N. Y.

The Cooperative Consumer, P. O. Box 2359, Kansas City 13, Mo.

Crops and Soils, American Society of Agronomy, 2702 Monroe St., Madison Wisc.

Down to Earth, Dow Chemical Company.

Digest of Farm News, 20 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago 6 (Nat'l Safety Coun-

The Furrow, Moline, Ill. (John Deere)

Harvester World, 180 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago (International Harveste

The Jersey Bulletin, 1142 N. Meredian St., Indianapolis, Ind.

Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, 608 Watson Bldg., Fairmont, W. Va. (SCS)

Kansas Farmer (Other State Agricultural Magazines), Topeka, Kansas.

Kansas Farm Bureau News (Other State FB Newspapers), Manhattan, Kansas

Kansas Grange Monthly (Other State Grange Magazines), LaCygne, Kansas.

Kansas Union Farmer (Other State Farmers' Union Publications), Topeka.

The Kraftsman, 500 Preshtigo Court, Chicago 90, Ill. (Kraft Cheese)

The National Grange Monthly, Myrick Bldg., Springfield 3, Mass.

National Union Farmer, 1555 Sherman St., Denver 5, Colo.

(M O R E)

National Livestock Producer, 139 N. Clark St., Chicago, Ill.

New Agriculture, 25 California St., San Francisco 11, Calif.

Phil Farmer, Bartlesville, Okla. (Phillips Petroleum Co.)

Soil Conservation, Supt. Documents, Washington 25, D. C.

Digest of Farm News, Akron, Ohio (General Tire and Rubber Co.)

Seed World, 327 South LaSalle St., Chicago 4, Ill.

Agronomy World, 300 Pulteney St., Geneva, N. Y. (Am. Soc. of Agronomy

The Organic Farmer (Farming without Chemicals), Emmaus, Pa.

Hoard's Dairyman, Ft. Atkinson, Wisc.

Market Growers Journal, 31 N. Summit St., Akron 8, Chio. (Vegetable Growers)

Others _____

_____

_____

Articles in those magazines dealing with farm problems:

Commonweal

Survey

Colliers

New Republic

Saturday Evening Post

Congressional Digest

Journal of Political Economy

The Nation

Consumer Reports

Consumer's Digest

New York Times Magazine

Science News Letter

The Scientific Monthly

Others _____

_____

_____

_____

WHAT THE WOULD-BE FARM EDITOR SHOULD STUDY

Sample Comments by Farm Editors

Although pre-testing did not indicate it, the first two questions proved to be nearly identical when working newspaper men responded to them. Pre-testing was faulty in that theoretical respondents were not actual working newspaper men. Some had been, but they were on a college teaching staff when tested.

Respondents after answering "What would you like to have him study before he became your assistant," found the next question: "What do you think of the attached curriculum in agricultural journalism (one now in effect at Kansas State College) an opportunity to strengthen their answers to the first question.

Except for those who wanted their future assistants to get "a strong general education, survey courses in agriculture, not too much on techniques, and other more or less general answers, replies to both questions were grouped together for this analysis.

They resulted in 24 suggestions for more writing, English, spelling, grammar, and literature. One respondent would have a future assistant major in English rather than in agriculture or journalism. The 24 suggestions were broken into five suggesting more English, five more grammar, four spelling, four more writing or journalism courses, two more literature, and two more speech.

Fourteen wanted more economics, agricultural economics, rural economics or farm management courses. They were divided:

Agricultural economics	4
Economics	7
Farm management	2
Rural Economics	1
Total	14

Fourteen also suggested strengthening the curriculum with history, government and social sciences:

Government	1
History	5
Political science	3
Sociology	2
International trade, geopolitics	2
Law	1
Total	14

Ten, or more than 25 percent, of the respondents found the Kansas State curriculum excellent, five, good, or outstanding. Others said it contained what they thought was important. But several of these suggested minor changes Eleven found the curriculum too technical, too specific, containing too much agriculture, or "one that would better prepare a student for extension or farm management work."

Most of the farm editors who replied to the questionnaire would add courses to the curriculum. Few offered deletions. When they did, total hours to be deleted were fewer than total hours to be added.

The researcher who prepared the questionnaire anticipated such responses. But he felt it would be unfair to ask working newspaper men to suggest deletions without having course descriptions on which to base their decisions. Asking them to read course descriptions would have made the questionnaire too long to be effective.

Twenty-nine additions to the curriculum were suggested a total of 76 times. As previously noted, grammar, English, history and government, and economics and marketing were those most frequently mentioned.

The suggested additions tabulated gave these results:

Marketing	5	Government	1
International Trade	1	Social Sciences	1
Sociology	2	Agricultural economics	4
Geopolitics	1	Economics	7
Political science	3	Rural economics	1
Law	1	Farm Management	2
History	5	Touch typing	2

Shorthand	1	Grammar	5
Photography	2	Speech	3
Promotion	1	Writing or Journalism	4
Publicity	1	Radio and television	1
Advertising	2	Foreign languages	2
Spelling	4	Philosophy	1
Literature	3	Psychology	1
English	5		

Farm background, books, education--all are wasted if one is not a good reporter. He might do well in something else, but not in the newspaper business. That is the opinion of Leonard O. Warner, farm editor of the Providence (Rhode Island) Journal and Evening Bulletin. He advised any student of agricultural journalism to go to work on any small daily or large weekly for at least two years.

> Let him disregard for that time all his ideas about agricultural journalism. Let him learn there--covering church socials, chimney fires and accidents--the rudiments of reporting.
>
> Right now, the student who dreams of immediately going into what seems a soft touch as an agricultural reporter will find it difficult to contemplate two years grubbing for news. But, I know that if he decides to try small town general reporting for a couple of years, he will later look upon those years as the best education he received.
>
> All this is not meant to deprecate college training for agricultural journalism. It merely serves to emphasize that old saw--you must learn to creep before you can walk.[1]

A. E. Oickle adds more to the importance of reporting and having the personality that drives one to report.[2]

> What most colleges apparently fail to clarify is the part personalities play in gathering news. Ernest Hemingway might write the best damned news story ever turned out but it might be he would never get that story. It could be that Ernie Hemingway's personality would forbid his getting "inside" his source--that is, gaining the confidence to bring out the character and nature of the story, whatever it is.

---

[1] Leonard O. Warner, Farm Editor, Providence, Rhode Island, Journal and Bulletin, letter in appendix.

[2] Alvin E. Oickle, Farm Editor, Greenfield Massachusetts, Recorder-Gazette, letter in appendix.

We have found that it is better to tell how Jon Jones succeeded with a trench silo than merely to run a story describing the technical aspects of such a silo. It increases readership (many know Jon Jones or have heard of him) and readability. Both are main goals in publishing a newspaper.

Actually, I think your curriculum does more to prepare the student for a job with the extension service.

If the would-be reporter doesn't want to report with all his heart --just as a young man might want to paint, sculpt, dance, sing or dig ditches with all his heart--he's wasting his time.

In the long run it boils down to one fact: the student must want to report, whatever type he chooses, more than he wants to eat. And if he is to become an experienced reporter, he will have to stagger through periods of low pay ($20 a week). That will be the true test in the final analysis.

Ranch and Farm World Editor Clyde H. Duncan of Tulsa, Oklahoma, praised the Kansas State College curriculum in agricultural journalism highly.[1]

He thought, however, a course or two in rural economics and rural sociology might be good additions.

He added, I have a friend here in Tulsa who heads the agricultural department of the Chamber of Commerce. He majored in agricultural economics at Arkansas University.

He tells me that when the New Deal went in, it nullified all of his college training because the law of supply and demand has been suspended ever since.

Duncan also thought a few good courses in advertising would not hurt the agricultural journalism student. "It is well to know how one's biscuit is buttered," he pointed out.

Ralph Hillgren thinks there is danger of over-educating farm journalists.

If it gets to the point where the farm editor or reporter tries to tell his readers things, instead of his observations, he will find resentment.

Too much farm background also could be dangerous, because the

---

[1]Clyde H. Duncan, Editor, Ranch and Farm World, Tulsa, Oklahoma, letter in appendix.

> person would consider everything about him obvious to his readers as well as to himself, and he would find no romance in common things. I believe, however, a generally good background, with respect for the occupation of farming and homemaking, is essential.[1]

Duncan, like so many other competent farm editors, puts "farmers themselves" at the top of his list of news sources.

Alvin F. Oickle, Farm Editor of the Greenfield, Massachusetts, Recorder-Gazette, after naming ten other news sources, said:

> The latter (farmers), of course, are the best bets. You can usually get more from them--pound for pound, as it were--in a half-hour conversation than you can from a professional farm man in a week. The reason is that a man working in the United States Department of Agriculture or some other professional organization cannot seem to remember what is the newest news in his office. The farmer will just plain talk without trying to determine what is newsworthy and what is not.[2]

> The same basic principles apply to any form of newspaper work, whether it be agricultural journalism or any other specialized reporting, said Leonard O. Warner, Farm Editor of the Providence, Rhode Island Journal and The Evening Bulletin.[3]

> I feel that a love of people is probably the most essential requisite. In the final addition, it is the reporter's ability to get along with people that will determine his success. If he likes people and they like him, the chances are great that he will continue to receive large numbers of story tips.
>
> The older I get--and I am 34--the more I realize that the first must I would insist upon in a new reporter is that he be just what the word reporter means. I would say that any assistant of mine--if we had need for one--first would have to be a damned good reporter.

George Thiem of the Chicago Daily News, whose diversion from farm reporting won him a Pulitzer prize last year, argues strongly for a well-rounded background in formal education:[4]

---

[1]Ralph Hillgren, Farm Editor, The Daily Argus-Leader, Sioux Falls, S. D., letter in appendix.

[2]Oickle, op. cit.

[3]Warner, op. cit.

[4]George Thiem, Springfield, Illinois, Bureau, The Chicago Daily News, letter in appendix.

During the War, The News (Chicago Daily) was short-handed and I found myself handling political and economic assignments where history, law, alertness on current events as well as some knowledge of accounting, the legislative mill, analysis and psychology came in handy. Maybe I'm arguing for a triple-threat kind of reporter who has a wide fund of knowledge and knows his way around in many subjects--even sports.

There isn't any sure-shot mixture of courses that will fit you for this, that, or the other job. It's pretty much up to the individual. One thing everyone must do is study his job and keep working and adding to his knowledge constantly.

Former Nieman Fellow Keickhefer is strong for reporting as opposed to teaching techniques of farming.[1]

I do not believe, he said, it is the function of a newspaper farm editor to tell farmers how to farm, except in remote or retarded farm areas. Farm magazines can give this service so much better at so much less cost to the subscriber. In addition, it is the function of such Federal Government agencies as the Extension Service, Farmers Home Administration and some of the rest to "teach" farmers how to farm.

If these agencies are not teaching the "slow" farmers these things, it is a legitimate endeavor of a farm editor to point out the deficiencies of these services in this respect and to "crusade" for improvement of the services.

I believe a newspaper farm editor, first of all, should be aware of the farm production pattern of his community. Then, he should be free to explore the various commodities produced in his home area. He should be able to talk to producers, to find out their problems. Then he should be able to discuss marketing problems, with both producers and handlers. And finally, he should be able to translate all this into terms of consumption.

To do all this, of course, a good farm editor should have a knowledge of all three phases--production, distribution and consumption.

But the primary need today, at least, is a sound knowledge of the economics of agriculture. Agricultural colleges and the Federal Government agencies have taught, or should be teaching, farmers how to grow two, or three or four, blades of grass where only one grew before.

But marketing and the whole problem of agricultural economics is one that goes far beyond the ag college and extension service. Next to economics, I believe, the need is for knowledge of rural sociology--the housing and general living and the educational needs of the rural communities.

---

[1] Kieckhefer, op. cit.

Ralph B. Whittum pointed to a big difference between reporting run-of-the mill news stories and reporting farm news.[1] City daily training, he felt, might make the reporter look for sensational stories on farms. Few farm stories are sensational, significant and accurate.

> I believe, he said, the farm editor should be just that and nothing else. He should include all that pertains to farms, farmers, and farming: woodlots, lumbering, gardens, etc., but should not be under the direction of a city editor who would then be prone to call him in for a "beat" assignment in an emergency. The offer to help with an emergency should come from the farm editor and not be a demand from the city desk. If the latter were true, there would be an emergency every week.
>
> I do not believe a good reporter will make a good farm editor; a good reporter, that is as some consider good reporters. In other words, we see reporters who seek out scandal and headlines--sometimes almost manufacture them--who will not observe a confidence. I don't think a good farm editor can do that.

Frank W. Bill gave a clue to the training employers look for in agricultural writers.[2] Last week, Bill reported, the editor of an important national farm paper asked for help in finding a writer to cover the Midwest. He did not want a journalism graduate, unless the graduate had had some experience on a daily newspaper. He wanted the reporter to have had farm experience.

On curriculums, Harold Rogers had definite ideas from his experience on the Walla Walla Union-Bulletin.[3]

> The most valuable course, he said, would have a minimum amount of material on the mechanical process of putting out a newspaper, with a

---

[1] Ralph B. Whittum, Agricultural Editor, Lewiston, Idaho, Daily Sun and Evening Journal, letter in appendix.

[2] Frank W. Bill, Farm Editor, Daily Pantagraph, Bloomington, Illinois, letter in appendix.

[3] Harold Rogers, Farm Editor, Walla Walla, Washington, Union-Bulletin, letter in appendix.

maximum emphasis on the production of clear, forceful, and interesting prose of professional quality.

I object to more than a minimum of technical courses in agriculture because they have a tendency, I believe, to fix ideas and theories which research may leave behind.

For the newspaper reporter, I suggest a most important requirement is to cultivate what has been termed (I believe by Lincoln Steffens) "informed ignorance." Don't jump at conclusions; ask questions. It is better to ask stupid questions than to write a stupid story.

Keep technical discussions to a minimum; those who need that can get it from other sources, and probably prefer to do so. The background and significance are more important from the newspaper's standpoint.

Mike Keyes thinks any intelligent reporter can cover almost any farm story that happens.[1]

Farm news reporters need not be technicians. They report the findings of technicians and, generally speaking, these technicians are so conservative that there is little danger any damage can be done by the reporting.

> If the reporter is so well versed in the subject that he can outtechnic the technician, he should get out of the reporting end of it and turn to technicking on his own.

The agricultural journalism student should be required to put in a good proportion of time attending farm meetings of all kinds and reporting them. That was the belief expressed by Tom Meanley. "It is the only way to hear technicians and real dirt farmers talking together and learn to recognize the real problems of agriculture."[2]

Most men trained in agriculture and journalism will find the field of public relations the one with the larger number of job opportunities, he said.

O. R. Trullinger, chief of the Office of Experiment Stations in Washing-

---

[1] Mike Keyes, Country Life Editor, "The Fresno (California) Bee, letter in appendix.

[2] Tom Meanley, Farm Editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar, letter in appendix.

ton,D. C., feels strongly that agricultural writers must be trained both as agriculturalists and as journalists.[1]

> It is important to farmers and everybody concerned that those who bring them information from our vast reservoir of agricultural research are professionally qualified to do so.

The information programs of agriculture are not keeping pace with its science. The latest reminder along these lines came in the form of a recommendation from the study group headed by D. Howard Doane which analyzed the effectiveness of agricultural research.

The group recognized that great accomplishments had been made in agricultural research. But they pointed to a weakness in revealing the results of this research to the public. They included a strong recommendation that has since been adopted by the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture headed by Congressman Stephen Pace.

This indicates a distinguished group of appraisers and an important subcommittee of Congress feels that research is weak in the information field.

Strong departments of agricultural journalism at our land-grant institutions are few and far between.

There must be a reason why deans and directors so frequently say, "If I could only get an editorial staff made up of people competently trained in both agriculture and journalism."

The Doane group said the job of telling about agricultural research was not being effectively done. Essentially this failure is due to a lack of properly trained people.

Home economics journalists should qualify as home economists, the same as agricultural journalists should qualify as agriculturalists. And both should have ample training in journalism.

Telling the truth about agricultural research, he concluded, and all that it has done and can do to alleviate the miseries and suffering of mankind, is a task of the first order.

A Proposed Agricultural Journalism Curriculum

As a result of recommendations made by the working farm editors, a four-year curriculum in agricultural journalism is proposed by the writer. It is

---

[1] O. R. Trullinger, in talk prepared for delivery before the 34th annual conference of the American Association of Agricultural College Editors, Keerville, Texas, Sept. 7, 1950, in appendix.

based on courses offered at Kansas State College. Names of courses may not indicate precisely what is covered in the course. In proposing changes to the existing curriculum at Kansas State, description of course contents, rather than course names, were used. Should the curriculum be used by another institution of higher learning, it is suggested that courses bearing the same description of contents, rather than courses with similar names, be used.

Forty-one hours not now required would go into the curriculum proposed. Room for them would come by dropping twenty-five hours presently required at Kansas State College and prescribing sixteen of the twenty-three elective hours students now have.

Rather than have so few elective hours, the author recommends that students entering the agricultural journalism curriculum attend two extra summer sessions to take courses they like and those their exploratory courses indicate are needed to strengthen their formal training.

The author recommends that the student make his own decisions on elective courses, guarding against advisers who suggest electives in their departments.

Replacing Man and the Cultural World I and Man and the Cultural World II, eight hours now required, would be course number 255, Cultural Reading (or English Literature I and American Literature II); 281, World Classics; and 228, Short Story I. Replacing the eight hours are nine; one hour of electives became required. So the student would be able to demonstrate the culture obtained from the nine hours, the writer would add 243, Advanced Grammar; and 219, Advanced Composition I, taking six more elective hours--and, in theory at least--adding to the students' ability to express themselves in writing.

For Man and the Social World I and Man and the Social World II, eight hours now required, the writer would substitute thirteen hours of history,

government, politics and culture: 105, American Industrial History; 209, World Cultures I; 210, World Cultures II; 252, Comparative Government, and 206, American Political Parties. This use of "solids" for "comprehensives" would eliminate five additional hours of electives.

Because the courses named to replace "social" and "cultural" courses would provide basic information needed to interpret contemporary affairs, the course, Interpretation of Contemporary Affairs, could be dropped without harm. Likewise, the other senior journalism course, Journalist in a Free Society, would be covered in history, government and political courses recommended and economics and sociology courses in the proposed curriculum. The proposed agricultural journalism curriculum carries an additional journalism course, 234, Reporting III. It also requires three elective hours in journalism for a total of twenty-seven journalism hours.

Course 209, Agricultural Policy, would replace 106, Farm Organization. Many of the respondents mentioned the importance of agricultural policy in interpreting and reporting current farm stories. History of agriculture, particularly since 1933, demonstrates its importance. In replacing 106, Farm Organization, the writer had the word of only one farm editor (who had taken the course at Kansas State College) that Farm Organization might be dropped. He indicated it was a waste of time; said two one-hour lectures could have covered the entire course. Since one opinion is not enough to base a decision on, perhaps the three-hour course should be recommended strongly as an elective. Retaining it would leave only one elective hour, unless students remained the two extra summer sessions recommended.

Seven more hours added to the curriculum, replacing electives, are 224, International Trade; 211, Agricultural Industries, and 156, Rural Sociology.

The resulting curriculum would be a straight-jacket for those who did

not take the two extra summer sessions. However, when one is old enough to attend college, he is old enough to be responsible eleven months a year. So the writer makes no apoligies for recommending the two extra summer sessions for electives. The third summer he would have any agricultural journalist, who had not been reared on a farm, accept day labor on as many different types of farms as possible. Those reared on a farm, he would have work on a country weekly newspaper or a small daily where they could get a survey of the publishing industry.

Since the average student is graduated from college at 22 years of age and works to age 65, the 43 months formal training (including the three extra summers) the writer did not feel was too heavy a period of preparation for 43 years of employment.

The proposed curriculum in Agricultural Journalism follows:

Freshman

First Semester

	Course	Sem. Hrs.
Engl.	111 Written Comm. I	3
Comp.	111 Biol. in Rel. to Man I	4
Comp.	101 Man's Phys. World I	4
An. Husb.	126 El. of An. Husb.	2 and
An. Husb.	129 El. of An. Husb. Lab.	1
Mil. Sc.	105 Military IA	1
Jour.	109 Journalism Lecture	R
Gen. Agr.	104 Freshman Assembly	R
Phys. Ed.	103 Phys. Education M	R
Gen. Agr.	103 Agr. Seminar*	R
	Total	16

Second Semester

	Course	Sem. Hrs.
Engl.	112 Written Comm. II	2
Comp.	112 Biol. in Rel. to Man II	4
Comp.	102 Man's Phys. World II	4
Dairy Husb.	101 El. of Dairying	3
Hort.	104 El. of Hort.	2
Hort.	105 El. of Hort. Lab.	1
Mil. Sc.	106 Military IB	1
Jour.	199 Jour. Lecture	R
Phys. Ed.	103 Phys. Education M	R
Gen. Agr.	103 Agr. Seminar*	R
	Total	17

Sophomore

First Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
History	105	Amer. Ind. History	3
Speech	103	Oral Comm.	2
Agron.	130	Soils	4
Poul. Husb.	104	Farm Poul. Prod.	2
	105	Farm Poul. Prod. Lab. . . .	1
Jour.	160	Agr. Journalism	3
Mil. Sc.		Military	1
Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Phys. Ed.	103	Phys. Education M	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
	Total		16

Second Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
Sociology	156	Rural Sociology	3
An. Husb.	152	Prin. of Feeding	3
Agr. Engg.	108	Farm Machinery	3
Jour.	187	Reporting II	3
Ent.	107	Gen. Econ. Entomol.	3
Mil. Sc.		Military	1
Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Phys. Ed.	103	Phys. Education M	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
	Total		16

Junior

First Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
Econ.	101	Economics I	3
Agron.	106	Farm Crops	4
Jour.	269	Magazine Article Wrtng . . .	2
Jour.	177	Prin. of Advertising	3
Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
Engl.	169	English Proficiency	R
Engl.	243	Advanced Gramma r	3
Gov't.	252	Comparative Government . . .	2
	Total		17

Second Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
Agr. Econ.	209	Agr. Policy	3
Agr. Econ.	202	Mktg. Farm Prod.	3
Jour.	149	News Photography	2
Jour.	162	Radio News	2 or
Jour.	181	Rural Press	2
Jour.	166	Editing	2

Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
Eng.	255	Cultural Reading	3 or
Eng.	170	English Literature I	3
Agr. Econ.	211	Agricultural Industries . .	2
Total			17

Senior

First Semester

Course			Sem. Hrs.
History	209	World Cultures I	3
Gov't.	206	American Political Parties .	3
Bot.	205	Plant Pathology I	3
Jour.	234	Reporting III	3
Eng.	281	World Classics	3
Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
		Electives	2
Total			17

Second Semester

Course			Sem. Hrs.
Econ.	224	International Trade	2
History	210	World Cultures II	3
Eng.	219	Advanced Composition	3
Eng.	228	Short Story I	3
Eng.	281	World Classics	3
		Electives	3 or
Eng.	174	American Literature II . . .	3
Total			17

---

*Four meetings each semester.

**At least three additional hours are to be elected in journalism, making a total of 27 hours.

Electives intended to strengthen the student in his fields of greatest interest may be selected from course offerings in agriculture, agricultural engineering, journalism, history and government, economics and sociology, speech and radio, graphic arts, including commercial illustration, and any of the basic or applied sciences relating to agriculture.

All students pursuing work leading to a degree in agricultural journalism are urged to spend two extra summer sessions to permit selection of electives and to have more time to participate during the regular terms in extra-curricular activities. Those reared on a farm should spend the third summer reporting for a small daily or large weekly newspaper. Those with urban backgrounds should accept farm day labor the third summer.

It is apparent that only careful planning of courses throughout a four-year period would make it possible to complete the proposed agricultural journalism curriculum in four nine-month terms. Some of the courses needed, for one reason or another, might not be offered the semester they are called for in the curriculum. However, with careful planning, the curriculum could be completed in four such terms. It would make an extra summer necessary for students who did not plan their courses well--and for those poorly advised or assigned. The penalty would be a blessing in disguise.

Then the student would add eight or nine hours of electives--or he could take a lighter load to participate more heavily in extra-curricular activities such as editing the School of Agriculture's student magazine, the College's daily newspaper, being a member of the Student Council, a fraternity officer or any of the other extra-curricular activities that appealed to the student in question. Some contend that it is possible to let books interfere with one's education--meaning, of course, extra-curricular activities.

WHERE AND TO WHOM FOR STORIES

Reference Books and Periodicals

Although fifteen different source or reference books were named for the farm editor by respondents, concensus seemed to be strongly for using living authorities instead of books. The fifteen books named will be added later in the thesis to the book references listed in the questionnaire.

Replying to what books the farm editor should have for references, the farm editors said: "The walking-talking kind," "Throw out stale books; get things a lot fresher from experiment stations," "Better to know authorities; books go out of date," "Build up instead a list of good local authorities," "None, his desk will pile high with reference materials from extension and

other agencies," and "See technical authorities" to fill in the deatils."[1]

Many of the editors said the man on the job should contact persons, but the same editors frequently checked what in their opinions were good reference books from the list submitted for their criticism.

They seemed to have the opinion that the farm reporter should have his book knowledge before reporting on the job. After that, he would build up a list of experts and quote live persons.

Ten books for backgrounding and interpreting farm news might be tentatively selected from recommendations made by the nine respondents (not enough for conclusions).

These ten, their authors, the general field they cover, and the number of farm editors who voted them "good" follow:

Soils and Men, Yearbook of Agriculture, 1938, agronomy, 6.

Feeds and Feeding, Frank B. Morrison, animal husbandry, 7.

Keeping Livestock Healthy, Yearbook of Agriculture, 1942, animal husbandry, 5.

Dairy Science, Its Principles and Practice, William E. Peterson, dairy husbandry, 6.

Destructive and Useful Insects, Their Habits and Control, Clell L. Metcalf and W. P. Flint, entomology, 3.

Announcements and Bulletins of State Agricultural Experiment Stations, entomology, 5.

Successful Poultry Management, Morely A. Jull, poultry husbandry, 3.

Readings in the Economic History of American Agriculture, Louis B. Schmidt and Earle Dudley Ross, agricultural economics, 3.

Farmers in a Changing World, Yearbook of Agriculture, 1940, agricultural economics, 4.

The Granger Movement, Solon Justus Black, agricultural economics, 3.

---

[1] See various letters in appendix.

The editors suggested 41 periodicals in addition to the list of 49 furnished by the researcher. Those suggested by respondents are listed below. If more than one farm editor named the periodical, the number who did so is listed preceding the periodical.

Peoria (Ill.) Journal
Chemurgic Digest (for what is new)
Soybean Journal
2 The Bible
Sears-Roebuck catalog (for to-the-point writing)
5 Farm Journal
4 Country Gentleman
4 Successful Farming
2 Capper's Farmer
2 Wallace's Farmer
Progressive Farmer
Breeders' Gazette, Louisville
Kansas City Star Weekly
Stockyards Journal, St. Joseph, Missouri
All Bredd Papers and Magazines
Journal of Farm Economics
Iowa Homestead
The Land
The Countryman (British Rural Quarterly)
Prairie Farmer
Farm Policy Forum (Iowa State College)
Harpers
Atlantic Monthly
Newsweek
Price and Production Reports of U. S. Bureau of Economics
The Farm Quarterly
Wall Street Journal
Chicago Journal of Commerce
Agricultural Statistics, annual of USDA
Statistical Abstract of U. S. Department of Commerce
Crops and Markets--Summary, 1950 edition, Vol. 27, USDA
Federal Reserve Bank Reports
USDA Yearbooks
2 USDA Reports
State Departments of Agriculture Reports
4 Bulletins from agricultural colleges
Nation's Agriculture
All "Situation" Reports of USDA, such as "Feed Situation," "Dairy Situation," etc.
2 Doane Agricultural Digest
2 Doane Agricultural Letter
Foreign Agriculture--USDA

The 41 references suggested under periodicals by farm editors, plus those they checked as good on the list of 49 supplied in the questionnaire, should

give the farm news reporter nearly all the different viewpoints on any current farm problem.

Of the 49 supplied, only four were not checked as good by at least one farm editor. The four are "New Agriculture," "Commonweal," "Survey," and "The Scientific Monthly."

The 45 that were named "good" and the number of editors who so classified them follow:

9 American Farm Bureau Federation Official News Letter, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago. (One editor warned that "it is very good but biased.")

8 Hoard's Dairyman, Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin.

6 Soil Conservation, Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C.

6 Cargill Crop Bulletin, 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

6 Crops and Soils, American Society of Agronomy, 2702 Monroe Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

6 The Furrow (John Deere), Moline, Illinois.

6 The Kansas Farmer and other state agricultural magazines.

5 Colliers.

5 Agricultural News Letter, E. I. DuPont deNemours and Co., Inc., Wilmington 98, Delaware.

5 The National Grange Monthly, Myrick Building, Springfield 3, Massachusetts.

4 Saturday Evening Post.

4 American Cyanagrams, American Cyanamid Company, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, New York.

4 Better Farming Methods, Watt Publishing Co., Mount Morris, Ill.

4 Down to Earth, Dow Chemical Company.

4 Digest of Farm News, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago 6, Illinois. (National Safety Council).

4 Harvester World, 180 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago (International Harvester).

4 The Jersey Bulletin, 1142 North Meredian Street, Indianapolis, Indiana.

4 Kansas Farm Bureau News, Manhattan, Kansas (and other state Farm Bureau newspapers and magazines)

4 Kansas Union Farmer, Topeka (and other state Farmers' Union publications).

4 National Union Farmer, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver 5, Colorado.

3 National Livestock Producer, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

3 Consumer's Digest.

3 Time.

3 New York Times Magazine.

3 Science News Letter (One said, "Fair, but leaning to sensation and little-used developments)

3 American Hereford Journal, 600 Graphic Arts Building, Kansas City, Missouri.

3 The Cooperative Consumer, P. O. Box 2359, Kansas City 13, Mo.

3 The Kraftsman, 500 Preshtigo Court, Chicago 90, Ill. (Kraft Cheese).

2 Digest of Farm News, Akron, Ohio (General Tire and Rubber Co.).

2 The Nation.

2 Aberdeen-Angus Journal, Webster City, Iowa.

2 Better Crops with Plant Food, 1115 16th Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

2 The Business of Farming, U. S. Gypsum Company, 300 West Adams Street, Chicago 6, Illinois.

2 Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, 608 Watson Building, Fairmont, West Virginia (Soil Conservation Service).

2 Kansas Grange Monthly, LaCygne, Kansas (and other state Grange newspapers and magazines).

1 Phil Farmer, Bartlesville, Oklahoma (Phillips Petroleum Co.)--now out of print.

1 Seed World, 327 LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Illinois.

1 Agronomy World, 300 Pulteney Street, Geneva, New York (American Society of Agronomy).

1 Organic Farmer (Farming without chemicals), Emmaus, Pennsylvania. (One respondent said "No;" another; "Use with care.")

1 Market Growers Journal, 31 North Summit Street, Akron 8, Ohio (Vegetable Growers).

1 New Republic.

1 Congressional Digest (He said, "For reference only).

1 Journal of Political Economy.

1 Consumer Reports.

1 Certified Milk, 1226 Broadway, New York 1, New York.

Although this section of the questionnaire had too few respondents to validate any definite conclusions, one has the feeling from studying answers submitted by the 14 that they might well give about the same percentages as 140 replies.

Few farm editors, for example, would be expected to be interested in farming without chemicals (Organic Farmer) or in a certain type of milk (Certified Milk of New York City).

On the other hand, The American Farm Bureau Federation is known to be the largest and strongest farm organization. Its official letter got more votes as a "good" source than any other periodical. Dairying, soil conservation, crop reports, soils, and state agricultural magazines were next in popularity. They probably would have been ranked about the same in comparative importance by 140 or 1400 respondents, if there were that many farm editors in the United States.

Sources for "Tips"

As several respondents pointed out in answering the question, "What and who are the best sources for tips," the answer seems obvious. Yet 23 of the 38 who replied to that question listed more than 40 excellent to good

sources, with few naming more than half a dozen. Top on the list, and the most obvious, source is farmers themselves. Two-thirds of those responding listed either "farmers, farmers themselves, farmers' wives, or key farmers. One described the best news source as "A road leading to a farm house." Another said to take any road off the main highway, stop at the third house "and there is a news story."

Next to farmers, county agricultural agents, agricultural extension agents or county agricultural advisers (as they are variously called in different sections of the United States) rated the most nods. Thirteen respondents named county agricultural agents specifically, while two others lumped them with home demonstration and 4-H club agents and named "extension agents."

The list of sources named with the number of times each was named by the respondents:

Leading Farmers, Farm Leaders, Farmers, Farmers themselves, Farmers' Wives, Key Farmers.	18
County agricultural agents, agricultural extension agents, or county agricultural advisers.	13
4-H club agents and leaders.	6
Feed dealers, grain elevator managers, fertilizer dealers. .	6
Vocational agriculture teachers.	7
Farm machinery dealers	5
The Agricultural Extension Service	6
Ag leaders or heads of ag associations	4
Home Demonstration Agents.	4
Leaders in the Grange.	4
Leaders in Future Farmers of America organizations	3
Agricultural Experiment Station staffs	3

The United States Department of Agriculture. 2

Extension agents 2

Agricultural college personnel 2

Insurance men. 2

Managers of Co-operatives. 2

Fair Society heads 2

Irrigation Officials 2

Business men 2

Agricultural workers 2

The Production and Marketing Administration. 1

The Soil Conservation Service. 1

The State Department of Agriculture. 1

PMA Committeemen 1

Free Mailing Lists of agricultural publications. 1

The Board of Trade 1

Sales Barns. 1

Livestock Commission men 1

Farm Mortgage men. 1

Land Management Agencies 1

Local Marketing Agencies 1

Commission men 1

Weekly Newspapers. 1

Government Agricultural Agencies 1

County Agricultural Commissioner's office. 1

Bankers. 1

Producer or Industry Groups rather than individuals of no particular position. 1

District Supervisor of the Soil Conservation District. . . . 1

Grazing experts. 1

Veterinary Medicine, doctor or clinic. 1

Milk and cream truck drivers 1

Farm hands 1

Editors' Comments

Tom Meanley, farm editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, pointed out that the best source for news tips depends on the man rather than the organization he is connected with.

> Needless to say, all government-paid agents are pretty well up on what is going on. Your Farm Bureau leaders are generally right on top. Some co-op managers are live-wire. Livestock commission men are always full of bull. Local insurance, farm mortgage, or land management agencies often have live-wire experts on what is going on. Feed and farm equipment men sometimes help, but they are too tied up with their own commercial enterprises to be of much use. Check with local marketing agencies and farm employment agencies.[1]

Harold Rogers of the Walla Walla Union-Bulletin prefers to use official and semi-official sources such as the extension service, soil conservation service, and producer or industry groups, "rather than individuals of no particular position. There are, of course, exceptions," he said,"but if you are going out on a limb on one man's opinions, be sure you want to be out there."[2]

Rogers checks his stories with several sources. He's had many "good" stories ruined that way. But he has found concensus more reliable, and farm news must be reliable.

He has found that one can seldom expect a sensational story which is also accurate and important. Rogers, like Meanley, pointed out that news sources

---

[1]Tom Meanley, Farm Editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar, letter in appendix.

[2]Harold Rogers, Farm Editor, Walla Walla Union-Bulletin, letter in appendix.

vary from place to place. The county agent may be a prime source in one county; of secondary importance in another. The farm editor must use his judgment in developing sources for reliable information.

For story tips, advised Frank W. Bill of the Bloomington (Illinois) Daily Pantagraph:

> Mingle with farmers, grain dealers, machinery salesmen, county agents. But learn to recognize a story, and keep eyes open. One of my best stories came on a rainy day while driving along a hard road. Glancing down a side road I saw a queer flash of light in a shed behind a house a quarter mile away. I instantly changed plans, went down to investigate, and found a farmer using a welding generator to make a 4-row corn planter with two old 2-row horse planters. That was about 12 years ago, one of the first of many 4-row planters. Photo and story were used in national farm magazines as well as my own daily farm news department.[1]

As for tips, said Ralph B. Whittum of the Lewiston (Maine) Daily Sun and Evening Journal, "The first job of a farm reporter is, in my opinion, to build up as quickly as may be, as wide an acquaintance as possible among farm people and those who work with farmers."

> Join the Grange, he said, and the Farm Bureau and attend their meetings. Cooperate with the County Agent, the Home Demonstration Agent, the 4-H Club agent. Become acquainted with all the extension people. Visit the State College as often as possible, also the State Department of Agriculture and all its allied branches.[2]

Former Nieman Fellow, E. W. Kieckhefer, Farm Editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, believes every newspaper should have a farm editor and every newspaper of substantial circulation for its community should have a farm editor who spends full time on that job.

> On a metropolitan newspaper, I feel, that the farm editor should be a free agent to move about the agricultural community at will, searching out the significant news that relates to both farmers and the rest of the community and wherever possible, his copy should make clear the

---

[1] Frank W. Bill, Farm Editor, Bloomington (Illinois) Daily Pantagraph, letter in appendix.

[2] Whittum, op. cit.

connection between farm news and the rest of the news.[1]

City people should learn to accept farm news on the same basis that they now accept news of labor, politics and government. Agriculture, after all, is an essential part of the national economy and should get the same treatment, not a treatment set apart like the retarded child at school gets.[2]

He would not departmentalize farm news, except in special circumstances. It makes demands upon the farm editor to fill a certain space each week whether the news that week justifies that amount of space or not.

Marion Teal (a woman) said, "I get out on the farms, take my own pictures, try to give the whole picture from 4-H events, through home extension projects, to latest machinery, fertilizers, and methods."[3]

Miss Teal also writes a weekly column, "Over the Fence," using gossipy items about crops, livestock, et cetera.

Cecil Hagen, managing editor of farm magazines for Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Utah (the Pacific Northwest Farm Quad) answered the question "Where do we get our tips?"

> From any and all sources we consider trustworthy and reliable. There is the stickler, deciding which ones are on the ball. In general, we get our best tips from technical men who are closest to farmers. That takes in county agents, such federal men as district supervisors with the soil conservation service, grazing experts, and the whole long list of specialists you find on every experiment station staff.
>
> In actual practice, as you well know, it works out that a good many of the specialists are fuddy-duddies and dry bags and consequently of not much copy value. On every staff there are a few fellows who really are progressive and alert. They are the gems and jewels we prize.
>
> We also get some fine tips from farmers we contact in field work. Like anyone else, we'll consider any tip on its merits but we have learned by experience to be mighty gun-shy of editorial Greeks who come bearing gifts.[4]

---

[1] Italics added.

[2] Kieckhefer, op. cit.

[3] Marion Teal, Farm Editor, Corvallis Gazette-Times, letter in appendix.

[4] Cecil Hagen, Managing Editor, The Pacific Northwest Quad, letter in appendix.

While maintaining that he was neither brash, nor competent, enough to answer questions the researcher was asking farm editors (in his questionnaire), Sydney P. Cook of the Ann Arbor (Michigan) News gave several clues to stories that he thinks need to be told.

> No doubt, however, your group and ours share basic virtues and vices. Brief flashes of unselfishness, abominable neglect of their rural schools, their children's ethical development and their own moral development. A distressing lack of shame over their dependence on glorified welfare payments from the rest of the citizenry.[1]

Although Cook ended with "Oh hell, my trouble is too much age," he obviously is keenly aware of economic and sociological problems facing rural America that need to be interpreted and reported to rural and urban readers alike.

Farmers themselves should not be overlooked as sources for news, said Ray Pierce, Managing Editor of the High Plains Journal. "The best way to get a good farm story is to drive out of town on a highway, turn at a road selected at random, and stop at the third farm house. If there is a farmer there, there is a story," he said.[2]

Good mixing anywhere and everywhere seems to be indispensable to good farm reporting, the same as for any other kind of reporting.[4]

OTHER TECHNIQUES AND QUALIFICATIONS

Importance of Photography

Most unanimous agreement on the six-page questionnaire came in response

---

[1] Sydney P. Cook, Farm Editor, Ann Arbor (Mich.) News, letter in appendix.

[2] Ray Pierce, Managing Editor the High Plains Journal, letter in appendix.

[3] Ralph V. Hillgren, Farm Editor, The Daily Argus-Leader, letter in appendix.

to the question, "How important is it that he (farm editor) be able to handle a camera? Develop and print negatives?"

Of 21 who answered the question, 19 called the ability to take good pictures "of utmost importance," "an absolute necessity," "a must," "of great importance," "important," and various other degrees of affirmation.

Of the other two, one said the ability to handle a camera "is nice, but not essential;" the other, "desirable, but not absolutely necessary."

More than 90 percent of the respondents, then, said the ability to take good pictures is almost a necessity; the remainder thought it a desirable technique to have mastered.

Likewise there was almost perfect agreement that the ability to develop and print negatives is not essential. Many thought it a waste of time. Only two even thought it desirable. Others answered "Far from essential," "No," "Not so important," and "of secondary importance."

> Knowing how to make good newspaper photographs is a must for a farm reporter, according to Tom Meanley.[1]

Mike Keyes has other reasons for feeling that the ability to handle a camera is of great importance:[2]

> A combination photographer and farm news reporter is becoming increasingly popular. Besides, a reporter who can take his own pictures has more of a stranglehold on his job and, with that security, will tend to be a better worker.

"I always carry a camera and run at least one picture daily, will average more," said Frank W. Bill, who thinks arrangement, position and lighting just as essential as camera technique.[3]

> I think it absolutely essential that the farm editor know how to use a camera and have it with him wherever he goes, whether on duty or

---

[1]Meanley, op. cit.

[2]Mike Keyes, Farm Editor, The Fresno Bee, letter in appendix.

[3]Bill, op. cit.

not.[1]

He can many times endear himself to his editor and publisher by picking up spot news stories of fires, accidents, oddities and many other things, as well as take pictures to illustrate his own stories.

I have a folding Zeiss-Eichorn (sic-Ikon?) with an F3/4 lens, shutter speed of up to 400, using a 120 roll film, with a flash gun which can be attached. I also have a built-in range finder which is very important.

This camera hangs on a strap from my neck and immediately after taking a picture I can drop it and use both hands to make such notes as are needed. This is the reason that I prefer it to any plate camera which is bulky to carry around all day when the primary job of the man is writing--not taking pictures.

If the publisher is equipped with a dark room and people to develop and print, there is no need for the farm editor to know how to do it.

I believe pictures can be one of the best mediums for conveying certain types of farm news.[2] Farmers are people who work with their hands. They prefer to see how things are done rather than hearing or reading about how to do them. I think you will find that equipment exhibits and farm demonstrations usually are well attended for that reason.

Inasmuch as the farm editor travels a good deal in the rural areas, often on rather indefinite assignments, a camera with flash attachment is a definite asset. Whether he should be able to develop and print his own pictures depends upon the facilities available at his office for fast processing.

It is of the utmost importance that students learn to handle a camera.[3] Few newspapers will employ a full time photographer just for farm news and hate to have their camera gone all day out in the country. I develop and print my own negatives and find it the most satisfactory way to get the job done when I want it done.

It is very important from our standpoint that a man be able to handle a standard news camera, and handle it well.[4] Training in developing and printing is just a waste of time as far as we are concerned. I took such a course and never have used it. On some little, two-bit publication a man might have to do his own developing and printing, but if he did that he wouldn't have much time to get any writing done.

---

[1] Whittum, op. cit.

[2] Kieckhefer, op. cit.

[3] Glenn Tabor, Farm Editor, Topeka Daily Capital, letter in appendix.

[4] Hagen, op. cit.

Several times I have dropped into A.P. offices in New York and Chicago, and noted, with much interest, the increasing number of photographers on the job and the growing demand for more and better pictures.[1]

I know absolutely nothing about the mechanics of photography, but I do my best to keep our two photographers as busy as possible. The readers fairly drool over some of the shots those boys catch.

> How important is it that he be able to handle a camera? Very important.[2] A good farm story may become a superlative farm story with pictures.

"The farm editor should know how to use a Graphic or Graflex Camera, and get good pix under all circumstances," by Clyde H. Duncan,[3] about summarizes the opinions of the farm editors who responded to the questionnaire.

The unanimity of editors for proficiency with a camera indicates that would-be agricultural journalists should learn to handle a camera before applying for a position. After a basic course, much photography can be learned with practice. The future farm editor should be taught to take pictures to illustrate his stories from the time he starts writing farm stories in his sophomore or junior year in college.

A basic photography course is in the proposed agricultural journalism curriculum. Since photography, somewhat like swimming, can be learned from practice, other courses were not added despite the overwhelming recommendations of editors. Other photography courses might be elected by students who spend the two extra summer sessions recommended in the proposed curriculum.

A Farm Background

Respondents were most evenly divided on the question of whether or not

---

[1] Cook, op. cit.

[2] Pierce, op. cit.

[3] Clyde H. Duncan, on form questionnaire in appendix.

a farm background is an absolute prerequisite to farm reporting. The question regarding a "sincere love of the land" being a prerequisite was poorly conceived. Although both "love of the land" and "a farm background" were part of the same question in the questionnaire, answers are separated here.

Of twenty-five respondents who commented on the necessity for a farm background, eleven said it was a prerequisite; nine said the farm reporter definity did not need a farm background; five indicated a farm background might be helpful, but that it was not a necessity.

Feeling on the subject went from "without question" and "absolutely" one needs a farm background to "no" and "absolutely no."

Those on middle ground recorded their feelings on the subject with such responses as "A farm background isn't necessary, but a Brooklyn boy who hates farmers couldn't make a good reporter," and "I don't believe so, but it would help."

Only fifteen commented on "love of the land." Most of them re-stated the question "love of people." The writer felt that "love of the land" should have been omitted from the questionnaire. "Love of people and genuine curiosity in people" are accepted criteria for would-be journalists.

Abbreviated sample answers to "love of the land" included:

"At least he must sincerely like farm people and realize he's no better than they.

"Sincere love of the land absolutely is required."

"Genuine interest in farm people is our top requirement."

"He'd better have 'a love of people' and be curious."

"He must know he's no better than farmers."

"Must know he's not writing for hayseeds."

"No, but he must have love for those he works with."

"Should love farm folks above all else."

"He must like people. People work the land. Without them it is scenery."

"Love of people is the most essential."[1]

Whittum gave a lengthy answer to the farm background question.[2]

> Your question about a farm background and a love of the land is a poser which will get you an argument with any CITY editor and most any publisher. I don't know whether I can answer it or not.
>
> I had a farm background, and when I stepped into this job, following a man who was known State-wide and had held the job for 25 years, I found it very valuable for me. I also enjoy growing things and like animals, except bulls, but I had rather make my living writing of them than doing them.
>
> Yes, I guess I do believe that a farm background and certainly an understanding of farm problems through having lived them would be quite a deciding factor in any man I would employ as an assistant. Certainly he must not think himself any better than farm folk, he must believe them the salt of the earth, for insincerity will quickly make itself known. He MUST have a sincere love for his work and enjoy meeting with and talking with farm people. He must be easy to talk to and with and know how to get along with old and young. He must be ready, willing, and eager to give freely of his time and his energy to aid any good farm cause and to work many times unreasonably long hours sometimes almost to the limit of his physical ability.

A Nieman fellow[3] indicated that a farm background hardly should be made an "absolute" prerequisite. We do not demand that our business page editor have been a businessman, banker, or stock broker.

We do not require that our labor reporter have a background as a labor organizer. We do not require our science reporter to have a background as a physician. Why, then, should we demand that a farm editor have been a farmer?

His job on the newspaper or magazine is not to farm but to write and edit news about farm matters and where possible to interpret that news. The business of "love of the land" is rather vague. To the extent that he should not be afraid to get mud or manure on his boots when the occasion demands, the answer should be yes. It is reasonable to assume, however, that if a man has what I consider a genuine "love of the land" he will be a farmer, not a farm editor.

---

[1] See letters in appendix.

[2] Whittum, op. cit.

[3] Kieckhefer, op. cit.

The Pacific Northwest Farm Quad (farm magazines for four Northwest states) makes a farm background their number one requirement for reports hired.[1]

> It is a mighty up hill proposition trying to train a fellow who has been brought up in a city on such matters as from which side to milk a cow, when certain crops are harvested and just hundreds of similar points which any farm-reared fellow knows.
>
> If a fellow doesn't know them, he betrays his ignorance in his copy and lets his publication open to ridicule by farmer readers. Ridicule by readers is a mighty wicked weapon.

Obvious conclusion to be drawn from the working farm editors is that a farm background is not an absolute prerequisite, but that it certainly is no handicap. Perhaps it should never be made a prerequisite to a job as a farm reporter; however, since several newspapers will not consider an applicant who does not have a farm background, students of agriculture with a flair for reporting or writing and who were reared on a farm might be urged to consider a curriculum in agricultural journalism.

A Broad Education

Is it more important for the student to get technical agricultural courses (as Elements of Animal Husbandry) or a broad general background in writing, history, economics and literature, including grammar and spelling?

Eighteen of 27 persons who responded to the questionnaire favored a broad, general education for farm reporters--most of them "most emphatically." On the other hand, those who favored technical training did not favor it so strongly.

Neiman Fellow Osburn Zuber argued for the broad, general education in this manner:[2]

---

[1] Hagen, op. cit.

[2] Osburn Auber, Farm Editor, Birmingham Post-Herald, letter in appendix.

In general, I should like to see more attention given to the broad economic side of agriculture in the presentation of farm news. The public, both urban and rural,[1] needs a better understanding of the part agriculture plays in the national economy.

Farming is largely individualistic; but the total results of the labors of millions of farmers add up to a vast national interest. It seems to me that most people are inclined to think of agriculture in terms of a single farm operation--perhaps a farm that they have lived on or have known. They do not get the broad picture. To use a possibly overworked expression, they don't see the forest for the trees.

True D. Morse, President of the Doane Agricultural Service (not a newspaper but publishers of business services to farmers and writers of feature services for various publications), said, "We like men well grounded in soils, economics and farm management. If, along with this, they have even elementary courses of other agricultural subjects, they can develop a more technical knowledge as they continue their studies on the job."[2]

Farm editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar recommended general training in agriculture with concentration on the crops and problems of the territory where the student intends to operate.[3]

> He need not be a technician, but he should be able to recognize good crops and good animals. He should know what good land management is. He should learn what people are interested in hearing about and to write not just to farmers, but to the general public. He should learn to be an interesting writer--he will always have ten times, a hundred times, the facts and figures he needs for any story.
>
> Technical courses offered in universities seem to me to be even too detailed for the practical agricultural technician. I think that the information that the agricultural agent uses in his day-to-day contact with farmers is enough for a farm journalist--and is pretty valuable.

Keyes maintains farm news reporters need not be technicians.[4]

---

[1]Italics added.

[2]True D. Morse, President, Doane Agricultural Service, Inc., letter in appendix.

[3]Meanley, op. cit.

[4]Keyes, op. cit.

They report the findings of technicians and, generally speaking, these technicians are so conservative that there is little danger any damage can be done by the reporting. If the reporter is so well versed in the subject that he can out-technic the technician, he should get off the reporting end of it and turn to technicking on his own.

A general education is fine, but for farm writing, it is essential, Bill pointed out, to be able to tell what is average performance and what is "news," which means something far beyond average, something different, a new combination or an improvement.[1]

Assuming that a fellow has had enough schooling to be able to use the English language with reasonable facility, we would prefer that his college training be heavier on the side of technical agricultural courses than on those taught on the liberal arts side of the campus, Hagen reported.[2]

> Basic subjects like history, economics and literature can't be skipped, but as I look back on my own journalism training a good many courses I took could have been omitted without any loss whatever. Had I had stuff like animal husbandry, agronomy and genetics instead, I would have been better off.

A reporter is essentially an observer and a word machine, observed Pierce.[3]

> He must be able to see what is going on and then put it down in understandable language for newspaper publication. He needs to study agriculture in general, English composition, sentence structure and spelling, and fundamental journalism.
>
> It is important that the student who expects to become a farm editor or reporter first be a good journalist.
>
> Before a man starts to build a corner cupboard, he must know his tools, and they must be sharp. Without the journalistic means to express himself, all the broad background in agriculture, no matter how technical, is of no value. If the agricultural journalism courses

---

[1] Bill, op. cit.
[2] Hagen, op. cit.
[3] Pierce, op. cit.

turn out good journalists, they will find ways of filling in the technical information they lack. If they can be given this information or at least the means of find it--familiarity with reference material--then the course will be successful.

He must know a silo from a barn, Oickle replied, but he doesn't need to know the percentage of United States farmers who do not use ensilage.[1]

CRITICISM OF JOURNALISM STUDENTS

Although most working newspaper men think journalism schools are doing an acceptable job, a pretty good job, or a good job of training future newspaper men, 13 of 42 respondents in this study made, for the most part, constructive criticism of the product journalism schools are turning out.

It could be concluded from the comment of the 42 respondents that colleges are, in general, doing a good job of educating for journalism.

However, the 13 who thought otherwise leveled an even two dozen charges against the young journalism graduates. Schools of journalism undoubtedly appreciate the "pat on the back." Undoubtedly, too, they are anxious to strengthen any weaknesses. For that reason the 24 criticisms are listed here in capsule form:

1. The college graduates of today are not realistic.
2. They expect to start too high.
3. They do not respect experience.
4. They need to serve as apprentices on a newspaper.
5. They don't know how to dig beneath the surface and get the whole story.
6. You teach them to be good reporters, but not promoters.
7. They don't know how to think.
8. They are too content with handouts.
9. They can't spell or write complete sentences.
10. They are dissatisfied with the usual run-of-the-mill stories.
11. They are geared for "BIG" stories--need humility.
12. Should make a stronger issue for interpretative writing.
13. Those trained in agriculture are notoriously poor writers.
14. They should get less theory and be exposed more to the real thing.

---

[1]Oickle, op. cit.

15. They have accumulated too much knowledge which never does them any good.
16. They cannot adapt.
17. They do not realize how important a part human relations play in getting the best stories.
18. They write too long; should be more concise and get the story told quickly.
19. Should realize that precision for top-notch performance comes only with EXPERIENCE.
20. They are not realistic.
21. Neglect routine work.
22. Do not expect low starting pay.
23. Must learn respect for practical experience.
24. Lack good education; do sloppy writing with indifferent spelling.[1]

Offsetting these deprecating remarks are many such as:

1. Those I know appear capable enough.
2. What criticism do I have of students the journalism schools and departments now are turning out? None.
3. Beyond the people Mr. Meeman has hired from journalism schools--and his choice is generally very good--I am not familiar with the kind of journalists the schools are turning out.
4. My present assistant, a combination photographer and reporter, is a graduate of Missouri University School of Journalism, and I gladly toss an orchid at that institution.[2] Besides taking good pictures, the boy writes a better story than I do, and I've been at it nearly 30 years. Youth!

THE RADIO FARM EDITOR

Similarities with the Newspaper Farm Editor

Of eight radio farm editors who responded to the questionnaire, five took the time and trouble to complete all six pages of it. This, if it held true with a larger number, would indicate more intense interest among radio men than among farm newspaper men in agricultural journalism studies.

Assuming that more responses by farm radio editors would have resulted in the same general trends indicated by the eight who did respond, one may

---

[1] See letters in appendix.

[2] For another view of that institution, read letter in appendix from Clyde H. Duncan, Editor of the Tulsa Farm and Ranch World.

conclude that attitudes, formal training, experience and techniques for the two jobs are extremely similar.

Only consistent difference indicated in responses was training in speech. Quite naturally, radio farm editors would include more speech training in the agricultural journalism curriculum. Few radio farm editors thought the ability to handle a camera important. However Sam Schneider, Director of KVOO, Tulsa, said, "Handling a camera is a must even in agricultural radio, but developing and printing can usually be hired."[1]

Seventy-five percent of the radio farm editors, like newspaper farm editors, prefer their assistants to get a broad general education. Like the newspaper men, those in radio would give agricultural journalism students more courses in economics, marketing, grammar, spelling, news writing experience, history and political science.

Opinions of Radio Farm Editors

Leo F. Presslin, Farm Director of KFGO, believes the farm director should have a broad educational background with a major in journalism.

> Primarily, he said, his studies should qualify him, as much as possible, to be an information specialist. While negotiating for my present job, I pointed out to the station manager that I had no farm background, had never even spent time on a farm. He replied: "If I wanted a farm expert, I'd hire a farmer. What I want is a good reporter."[2]

> The important thing is not that he should know a good deal about farming, but that he should know how, where, and when to get his information when it is necessary...and then have the journalistic, technical know-how to process it and put it across.

On the other hand, Herb Plambeck, Farm News Editor of WHO, prefers an

---

[1] Sam Schneider, Farm Radio Director, KVOO, letter in appendix.

[2] Leo F. Presslin, Farm Director, KFGO, letter in appendix.

assistant to have a farm background.

> In order to be a well informed, widely read or heard farm editor, I'd want him to have had practical experience with crop and livestock production. Membership as a boy in 4-H or FFA activities would be highly valuable. A knowledge of athletics (farmers are sports-minded) is helpful. So is an appreciation of world and state events, and economics. He would have to have at least a passable knowledge of grammar and, of course, he would have to be able to spell.[1]

Harold E. Cunningham, Program Manager of KGEM, said a farm background is, without question, an absolute prerequisite for a farm radio director.

> ...so that the person is better equipped to select truly helpful, practical material for presentation, rather than the too-often highly theoretical items that contain questionable practical information.[2]

Farm Editor Phillip Combs of WSBT, thinks it more important for a student to get a good technical background in agriculture than it is to have extensive study in history, writing and grammar.

> I have seen some good stories very badly written by good reporters who lack knowledge of the farm. Although a farm background is not essential, it will aid a farm editor to better understand the problems of the farmer and will enable him to better interpret stories.[3]

Radio farm editors, for the most part, think students should get more training in business, promotion and publicity. One would judge from responses received that radio farm editors, more than newspaper farm editors, must justify their existence to their employer--with financial returns.

Schneider explained it:[4]

> Obviously, he must have studied agriculture, but if he's a farm boy and knows the pulse of agriculture, the job will be easy providing he has studied publicity, promotion and advertising technique. Your curriculum is not heavy enough in these fields.

---

[1]Herb Plambeck, Farm News Editor, WHO, letter in appendix.
[2]Harold E. Cunningham, Program Manager, KGEM, letter in appendix.
[3]Phillip Combs, Farm Editor, WSBT, letter in appendix.
[4]Schneider, loc. cit.

As for his background in writing history, economics and literature, they are all important and should be taken very seriously, but the most important thing that he will learn is the technique of publicity. By that I don't have any reference to his ability as a writer; I have reference to his ability to map and execute a campaign. Maybe this will help you better to see what I mean. Any journalist can learn to be a reporter with plenty of grammar to prepare a top story, but unless that story fits into a campaign to sell such related subjects, it is just another story.

I feel a farm editor should take a great part in the development of the agriculture in the community, rather than just waiting for something to happen for him to report. In other words, if he can help organizations map campaigns and get them executed, he is truly serving the community.

A journalism curriculum which teaches him only how to be a good reporter has stopped way short of the mark.

Jack Jackson, Director of Agriculture for KCMO, points to 200 members of the National Association of Radio Farm Directors and others not members of the association to show the opportunities in farm radio.

"Each of these members devotes a major portion of his time to broadcasting and interpreting farm information," he said.[1]

I am sincere in my belief that training for prospective radio farm directors is being neglected, he said.

Survey after survey has shown that farmers get more farm information from the radio than from any other type of media. Yet our major training efforts are still for the Press.

Oscar Cooley of WIBC argued strongly for a broad general education with technical subject matter getting secondary attention. The radio farm editor, he said, should have good basic knowledge of our economic system and how it works.[2]

The American farmer markets his produce in the freest market in the world, and that I think is the basic reason why he is the most prosperous farmer in the world.

---

[1] Jack Jackson, Director of Agriculture, KCMO, letter in appendix.

[2] Oscar Cooley, Farm Director, WIBC, letter in appendix.

> Why does the free market make the farmer prosperous? That is a 64-dollar question that every student of farm journalism should spend a good deal of time studying. Therefore, I think your curriculum could stand more studies in Economics and Marketing.[1]

Remainder of the questionnaires from radio farm directors showed little difference from those of the newspaper farm editors. Like the newspaper men, the radio farm directors, get their best tips from: county agricultural agents, home demonstration agents, 4-H club agents, teachers of vocational agriculture, the State Extension Services, FARMERS THEMSELVES, commercial and academic experiment stations, the United States Department of Agriculture, and dealers in fertilizers, feeds, farm machinery and other farm equipment.

Like the newspaper men, those in radio said the college graduate today expects to land a top job, has too little respect for experience, is unrealistic, needs more practical and less theoretical training.

Books Recommended by Farm Radio Men

Books recommended by at least 40 percent of the radio farm directors are about the same the newspaper men selected. Only five radio farm directors completed the book section of the questionnaire. Books at least two editors said were good references are listed below with the number recommending them preceding the book titles:

4 The Nature and Properties of Soils by T. Lyttleton Lyon and Harry O. Buckman.

2 Fundamentals of Soil Science, Charles E. Millar and L. M. Turk.

4 Feeds and Feeding, Frank B. Morrison.

3 Types and Market Classes of Livestock, Henry W. Vaughn.

2 Keeping Livestock Healthy, Yearbook of Agriculture, 1942.

3 Dairy Science, Its Principles and Practice, William E. Peterson.

---

[1] Loc. cit.

2 Destructive and Useful Insects, Their Habits and Control, Clell L. Metcalf and W. P. Flint.

2 Announcements and bulletins from the Federal Bureau of Entomology.

2 Announcements and bulletins of state agricultural experiment stations.

2 Diseases of Fields and Crops, James G. Dickson.

3 Successful Poultry Management, Morely A. Jull.

2 Readings in Economic History of American Agriculture, Louis B. Schmidt and Earle Dudley Ross.

2 Elements of Agricultural Economics, G. A. Forester and Marc Leager.

2 A History of Agricultural Experimentation and Research in the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Alfred Charles True.

2 A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, Alfred Charles True.

Periodicals Recommended by Farm Radio Men

Except for a little less stress on soil conservation, the farm radio directors chose about the same periodical references as the newspaper farm editors.

From the list submitted for their approval, farm radio directors omitted "Certified Milk" (as did farm newspaper editors), "Journal of Soil and Water Conservation," "New Agriculture," "Soil Conservation," and "Seed World."

Most popular periodical references among the farm radio directors were:

The American Farm Bureau Federation Official News Letter

The National Grange Monthly

Down to Earth (Dow Chemical Company)

Better Farming Methods

Better Crops with Plant Food

American Hereford Journal

Aberdeen-Angus Journal

Agricultural News Letter

Hoard's Dairyman

Sixty percent of the farm radio respondents checked those periodicals as good references. Periodicals that got an affirmative nod from at least 40 percent of the radio farm editors were:

The Business of Farming

Cargill Crop Bulletin

The Cooperative Consumer

Crops and Soils

Digest of Farm News

The Furrow

The Jersey Bulletin

Kansas Farmer (and other state agricultural magazines)

Kansas Farm Bureau News (and other state Farm Bureau newspapers and magazines)

National Union Farmer

Colliers

Saturday Evening Post

Consumer Reports

Consumer's Digest

Time

Science News Letter

Those approved by only 20 percent of the farm radio directors included:

American Cyanagrams

Harvester World (International Harvester)

Kansas Grange Monthly (and other state Grange magazines)

Kansas Union Farmer (and other state Farmers' Union publications)

The Kraftsman (Kraft Cheese)

National Livestock Producer

Digest of Farm News (General Tire and Rubber Co.)

Agronomy World

Market Growers Journal (vegetable growers)

Comparison of the list selected by the farm radio directors shows a great similarity with the one selected by the farm editors of newspapers. Likewise the list added to the questionnaire by the farm radio directors includes many of the same magazines that were suggested by the farm editors. The regional farm magazines were most popular with both groups.

Sixty percent of the radio respondents suggested "Successful Farming;" 40 percent, "Country Gentleman." Other periodicals suggested by the radio farm editors follow:

Wallace's Farmer

Farm Journal

Capper's Farmer

Doane's Agricultural Service

Duroc News

Farm Quarterly

Poultry Tribune

Artificial Insemination

Curtis Candy Company (The author is not acquainted with it)

Kansas City Weekly Star

Idaho Farm Journal

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

Greed and selfishness are creating tensions between rural and urban

persons. The two segments of society are interdependent with each other and with other segments of total society. A study of economics, history and politics shows that good times and abundant living does not come for an isolated segment of any given society.

It appears that a good newspaperman should amplify the tensions on different sides of any controversial issue, try to arrive at the truth, explain it, illustrate it, background and interpret it to the public.

To interpret farm news, it seems future agricultural writers must understand marketing, production, consumption and other phases of economics, political science, and sociology before going on the job. To get at the truth of current issues, it then appears they will be forced to study such magazines as New Republic, Commonweal, Atlantic, Time, Fortune, Life, Nations Business, Wall Street Journal and others amplifying different viewpoints. Science, economic, political, and sociological magazines also should be on the farm editor's reading list, plus those that keep him abreast of current happenings in agriculture.

Few of the magazines will give an unbiased view. The farm editor must know their biases to recognize them. His job is to present the truth--usually found somewhere between the extremes espoused by the various magazines listed.

Readers probably will suspect the farm editor of being biased toward agriculture. So farm editors, like the wives of Henry VIII and Caesar, will have to take every care to keep themselves above suspicion. To be effective, they must build a reputation for integrity.

It appears that agricultural issues of the day will continue to emanate from Washington. Whether it is margarine-butter, parity, subsidies, supports, allotments, or wheat as a feed compared to corn, there will be two sides to

the story--with strong backers on both sides. The farm editor's job, like that of any other newspaperman, will be to determine the truth and tell it to the people.

Farm editors throughout the United States today feel that photographs and illustrations can be used much more widely in interpreting and telling the agricultural story to both rural and urban readers. Whenever possible, the farm editor should strengthen his story with graphic illustrations.

Advertisers use illustrations to sell their products. Truth in agricultural news is the farm editor's product. Pictures, charts, drawings and diagrams would help him sell that product.

Letters from working farm editors indicated that few publishers feel much responsibility for the farmer. Farm editors will have to show publishers that the service they are giving farmers (honest information interpreted so it is meaningful) is making money for the publisher.

Earlier research indicated that farmers are anxious to keep up with news and to know what it means. They probably will take the paper that comes closest to interpreting news so it is meaningful to them. The farm editor who does that quite likely will be able to point to increased farm (and urban) circulation and subsequent advertising.

Nearly all farmers, like nearly all their city cousins, take daily newspapers. They do it to get the news, but the large rural circulation figures do not mean that the farmer is pleased with the product he gets. He probably wants better farm news. Farmers on poor country roads put chains on their cars to get to town when it rains. But arguing that the large number of farmers who buy chains indicates they want to use chains would be absurd. The same might be true with the large number who subscribe to some of the daily newspapers.

It does not appear that many farm editors will be able to do much more than scratch the surface on interpreting and backgrounding stories to make them meaningful.

Only definite conclusion to be drawn from the list of books submitted to help farm editors background and interpret farm news is that most of them have no time for books. Only nine of more than 40 who returned questionnaires graded the books "good," "fair," or "poor." Many ended letters with, "I do not feel qualified to comment on your suggested references"--or the same in substance.

Most of those who responded to this section of the questionnaire indicated "book knowledge goes out of date; it is better to get a "walking-talking" reference.

The fact that farm editors do not have time for books was illustrated further. The questionnaire provided a blank under each of ten separate headings for respondents to suggest "other references." Since nine responded, there were a total of 90 blanks they might have completed. Only one of the nine made any suggestion. He made only one: "the works of Dr. Albrecht of Wisconsin University, Madison."

Digging below the surface apparently takes more time than most publishers are giving their farm editors.

Contrasted with the one suggestion as a reference book were 41 different publications suggested with nine of the 41 repeated from two to five times by different editors--an indication that farm editors do a good job of keeping up with and knowing what the current agricultural news is.

On the basis of replies, remarks, if not conclusions, seemed in order. Although respondents stressed that more political science, much more economics and more history should be included in the submitted agricultural journalism

curriculum, only one named "The Journal of Farm Economics" as a good reference. Only one checked the "Journal of Political Economy." Only one mentioned the Congressional Digest. None mentioned a sociology magazine.

Political, economic and sociology were at the bottom of the list of references for working farm editors. Magazines on soils, crop reports, soil conservation and specialized farming were at the top of the working editors' list.

To the uninitiated, congressional and political discussions sound more interesting than soil conservation, crops, soils and specialized farming. But one group shows a farmer how to make more money. The other shows no money returns, no trinsic values.

Yet curriculum recommendations made by farm editors indicated that they know that economics, politics, history, literature, and sociology are important to rural and urban populations alike.

Is it illogical, incongruous, then that the farm editors did not recommend current periodicals in those fields? Probably not.

The daily newspaper is produced at too fast a tempo and on too tight a work schedule for those who write farm news to spend time with references needed to interpret and background the current stories.

Only the largest metropolitan dailies have payrolls to support an agricultural writer doing research necessary to interpret the over-all farm news.

It appeared to this writer that daily newspapers, to do more interpretation of agricultural news, might hire men who had this background information from formal or other training so they (the reporters) could do backgrounding without much use of reference books.

This is an argument for strong agricultural journalism curriculums in the colleges and universities. It also is strong argument for the three major

wire services to use agricultural journalists, particularly on their Washington and major farm market center staffs. To date the three major wire services have only one agricultural writer in Washington. He is not working full-time reporting and interpreting farm news.

That few agricultural stories are backgrounded with economic and political facts probably is one of the prices paid for a free press. In a competitive society, the newspapers must give their readers what the readers want--NOT what the farm editors want the readers to have.

When they made curriculum recommendations, farm editors indicated they would like to have economics, politics, sociology, literature and history understood.

To the writer, many theories of farm editors paralleled those of many college professors.

But when the farm editor sits down to produce copy, he must put aside his theories and face reality. He could dig through books, pamphlets, periodicals, the Congressional Record, read a left, a right and a middle-of-the-road view, talk to persons with various views. He then, very likely, could produce one of the best stories of the week. But unless he is on the staff of one of the largest metropolitan dailies in the United States, he's more likely assigned to fill a page a day. On one of the largest newspapers, his assignment probably would be one such story a day.

Rather than condemn current farm editors, whose theories are about the same as those of college professors, perhaps the college professors teaching agricultural (and other) journalists should take each seventh year off and become working newspaper men.

Following a year of reality, the professors would be in a better position to bring reality and theory into working relationship than are most daily newspaper farm editors.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

If the writer gave full credit to all who had a hand in this thesis, the acknowledgment sheet would stretch to several pages.

Prof. Ralph R. Lashbrook, head of the Department of Technical Journalism and the candidate's major instructor, deserves most credit if the writer has succeeded in adding useful knowledge to the field of agricultural journalism. He suggested the work, encouraged the writer--and even scheduled classes, taught by the author of the thesis, to allow more time for research.

The writer is grateful for help from the Kansas State College library staff "beyond the line of duty" in searching for documents and other materials used. Miss Elizabeth Davis of the reference department was particularly helpful in ordering from libraries of other colleges and universities theses and doctoral dissertations used in preliminary study.

Prof. William A. Sumner, of the department of Agricultural Journalism at the University of Wisconsin, was kind enough to lend his personal copy of William Ward's thesis and appendix, to the writer.

Highly appreciated, also, were letters and completed questionnaires received from farm and radio editors throughout the United States. Some who work twelve to sixteen hours daily took time to answer the six-page questionnaire and to offer valuable suggestions gained from experience in personal letters highly appreciated by the recipient.

The writer is one of a family of four. An unmarried reader might not understand that this automatically made the thesis a family affair. The incentive furnished by the younger members was appreciated. Married readers need not be told that the thesis has an unnamed co-author, also mother of two.

REFERENCES

Books

Bond, B. W. The Quit-Rent System in the American Colonies. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919.

Brook, W. E., Editor. The Agricultural Papers of George Washington. Boston, New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1919.

Buck, S. J. The Agrarian Crusade. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919.

Cato, Marcus Porcius. Roman Farm Management. Translated by A Virginia Farmer. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913.

Clemen, R. A. The American Livestock and Meat Industry. 1923, p. 323.

Gras, Norman Scott Brien. A History of Agriculture in Europe and America. New York: F. S. Crofts and Co., 1940.

Lipscomb, Andrew A., Editor. Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1943.

McCune, Wesley. The Farm Bloc. Garden City: Double, Doran and Company, Inc. 1943.

Sparks, Jared, Editor. Works of Benjamin Franklin. Chicago: Townsend-MacCoun, 1882.

Turner, Arthur W., and Johnson, Elmer J. Machines for the Farm, Ranch, and Plantation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948.

Varro, Marcus Terentius. On Agriculture. Translated by William Davis Hooper, revised by Harrison Boyd Ash. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1934.

Young, A. Travels in France During the Years 1787, 1788, 1789. Edited by Betham-Edwards. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1889.

Periodicals, Journals and Publications of Professional Organizations

"Apropos Facts and Figures." Congressional Digest. p. 80, March, 1950.

"A View of the Farm Political Scene." Congressional Digest. p. 79, March, 1950.

Barber, E. Lloyd. "Notes." Journal of Farm Economics. p. 49, May, 1948.

Brecher, Edward M. "What's Happening to Eggs?" Consumers' Reports. p. 131-4, March, 1950.

"Congress Debates Farm Price Supports." Forum. p. 351, December, 1949.

"Farm Legislation 1796-1950." Congressional Digest. p. 71-78, March, 1950.

Fuller, Helen. "Lets Look at the Lobbies." New Republic. p. 16-19, January 3, 1949.

"How High?" Time. p. 51, December 27, 1948.

Joness, C. B. "Postwar Agricultural Policy--Pressure vs. General Welfare," Journal of Farm Economics. p. 17, February, 1947.

Kiechhefer, E. W. "The Farmer and the Daily Press." Nieman Reports. p. 12, April, 1948.

Kline, Allen B. "What the Farmers Want." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. p. 122, 1950.

Kramer, Dale. "What the Farm Shooting Is All About." Survey. p. 126, March, 1950.

LaFollette, Robert M., Jr. "Some Lobbies Are Good." New York Times Magazine. p. 15, 54, 58, May 16, 1948.

Lambert, W. V. "Research Yields Billions." Science News Letter. p. 230-31, April 22, 1947.

"Lining Deep Pockets." The Commonweal. p. 597, March 17, 1950.

Long, Erven J. "Returns to Scale in Farming." Journal of Political Economy. p. 543-6, Dec., 1949.

MacDonald. Angus, "Henry Luce and the Farmer." New Republic. p. 31, May 26, 1947.

M(encken), H. L. "Editorial." The American Mercury. 1:292:296, 1924.

Mezorik, A. G. "The Brannan Plan." New Republic. p. 11, Nov. 28, 1949.

"1950's Never-Normal Granary." Business Week. p. 31, March 4, 1950.

"Pace Farm Bill." New Republic. p. 7-8, July 11, 1949.

Pearson, Frank A., and Paarlberg, Don. "Sixty Million Jobs and Six Million Farmers." Journal of Farm Economics. p. 28-41, Feb. 1946.

Raymund, Bernard. "Correspondence." New Republic. p. 31, March 28, 1949.

"Rock Ribbed Farmers." New Republic. p. 11-17, Feb. 28, 1949.

Rorty, James. "Power to Feed." The Commonweal. p. 615-17, Oct. 10, 1947.

"Rustle in the Grass Roots." Time. p. 10, Dec. 26, 1949.

Schultz, Theodore W. "Reflections on Poverty Within Agriculture." Journal of Political Economy. p. 1, Jan. 1946.

Skillin, Edward, Jr. "Four Million Families." The Commonweal. p. 302, July 11, 1947.

"So Long, Ed." Time. p. 14, Dec. 29, 1947.

Soule, George. "Do Farmers Want Inflation?" New Republic. p. 652-3, May 6, 1946.

Stakeman, E. C. "Science in the Service of Agriculture." The Scientific Monthly. p. 75, Feb., 1949.

Sumner, William A. "The Press and Agricultural News." American Academy of Political and Social Science. 219: 114-119, Jan., 1942.

Timmons, John F. "Farm Ownership in the United States." Journal of Farm Economics. p. 83, Feb., 1948.

"The Compromise Farm Bill." The Nation. p. 406, Oct. 29, 1949.

Wallace, Henry. "Report on the Farmers." New Republic. p. 2, June 30, 1947.

"What the Present Law Provides." Congressional Digest. p. 75, March, 1950.

"What? How? Why?" Consumer's Guide. p. 3, April, 1947.

"Why the Farm Plan Lost." New Republic. p. 6-7, Aug. 1, 1949.

"Would the Brannan Plan Be a Sound Policy Pro and Con." Congressional Digest. p. 86-88, March, 1950.

"Yes, But Whose Welfare?" Collier's. p. 74, Mar. 4, 1950.

Unpublished Material

Burkett, Winfred. Acquiring Farm Ownership by 100 Percent Loans. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1948.

Moore, Carl Henry. Future Trends in the Marketing of Livestock and the Distribution of Meats. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., 1948.

Schmukler, Sidney. Wisconsin Farmers in Industry. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1947.

Schoff, Leonard H. One Farm or Two? Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Columbia University, New York City, 1948.

Ward, William B. A Source Survey of Agricultural News in the Daily Press. Unpublished M. S. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1941.

Wissler, Ray F. A Testing of Reader-Acceptance of Content for a Proposed Weekly Farm Magazine. Unpublished M. S. thesis, Leland Standford Junior University, Stanford University, California, 1946.

Government Documents

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government: Report of Task Force on Agriculture. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949.

Congressional Globe. 37th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: John C. Rives, Congressional Globe Office.

Congressional Globe. 37th Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington: John C. Rives, Congressional Globe Office.

Congressional Record. 77th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Congressional Record. 78th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Congressional Record. 78th Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Congressional Record. 80th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Congressional Record. 81st Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Glass, Hon. P. T. Congressional Record, 49th Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1887.

Harding, T. Swann. Condensed History of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. United States Department of Agriculture. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949.

Harlan, James. Congressional Globe. 37th Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington: John C. Rives, Congressional Globe Office.

House Journal. 76th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1939.

House Journal. 76th Cong., 3rd Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1940.

House Journal. 77th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1941.

House Journal. 78th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1943.

House Journal. 79th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1945.

House Journal. 79th Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946.

Senate Journal. 77th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1941.

Senate Journal. 79th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1945.

Senate Journal. 79th Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946.

Senate Journal. 80th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948.

Senate Journal. 81st Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Origin, Structure, and Functions of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949.

Wilkerson, Mr. Congressional Globe, 37th Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington: John C. Rives, Congressional Globe Office, 1862.

EDITING AND INTERPRETING FARM NEWS IN THE METROPOLITAN DAILY

by

EDWARD LOWELL BRANDNER

A. B., Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1937

B. S., Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1937

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Technical Journalism

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1951

INTRODUCTION

The theory the candidate for a degree thought should go in a course called "The Farm Page" went into the first part of the thesis. The second part of the thesis checked this theory with working farm editors.

A questionnaire was sent to 280 farm editors of larger daily newspapers in the 48 states of the United States. It also went to 70 Midwest farm radio directors. The study was based on a return of slightly more than an anticipated 10 percent return. Two Nieman fellows, a Pulitzer prize winner and many college graduates were among the respondents. The researche also found at least one crank in the group, ironically a Kansan.

ETHICS IN FARM NEWS

Codes of Ethics, Canons of Journalism, and a Journalist's Creed can be followed for a code of ethics. Ethics in farm news consists largely in erasing national tensions by truthfully showing the interrelation of various segments of society.

Whether a person is a U. S. producer, processor, transporter, retailer, wholesaler or a consumer of farm products, he is part of an interrelated economic system that has produced the highest standard of living known. Newspaper men not showing this interrelation are unwittingly fostering the deplorable attitude among many American groups that the only realistic policy is to "get all you can."

A SHORT HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE

Some 2200 years ago, Marcus Porcius Cato wrote instructions for a farm near Rome. His instructions and those now disseminated by college extensior

services stressed the same things: rotation, leguminous crops, apply fertilizers, market crops on the hoof.

Early Romans, before Christ's time, were nearly all agricultural men.

However, most of America's farm heritage came from England, Scotland, France and Germany. America developed an economic system with three attributes not known in the economic system of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

1. The American owner has undisputed possession against claims of other individuals.

2. He is free to dispose of what he owns.

3. He is not obligated to make payments for using his own property. (Some maintain taxes are becoming confiscatory, however.)

Contrasted to this system is Communism. It covers more than two-thirds of the world's surface, so must be recognized as one of the most important systems of land holding in human history.

Early Americans (Indians) held land in common with no one claiming title. But the system has never been both an economic and a social success.

America is distinct for developing free proprietorship of property. It is more 100 percent American than religious liberty, popular sovereignty, freedom of speech and press.

The Homestead Act, Pre-emption and other systems of getting the land settled, put the land into private hands and enthroned free proprietorship. Because lands were plentiful and cheap and labor dear, the lands were used lavishly. Conservation needed now is one of the prices paid.

President Washington was the first American business farmer. He kept accurate records on all his crops, fields and livestock. He corresponded with Arthur Young and Sir John Sinclair in England, sought ideas, seeds, plows, laborers, a manager and tenants from England. He could not be judged

a successful farmer. However, had he not been away from home drawing up the Constitution and being president, he might have been remembered as the Father of American Agriculture.

Department of Agriculture

The USDA started in the patent office where seeds from foreign countries were gathered and distributed. Congress appropriated $1,000 for agricultural work in 1839. The Department was created May 15, 1862, after 10 years of lobbying by the U. S. Agricultural Society, and with the threatening Civil War.

The Homestead Act followed in five days and two months later the Land-Grant College Act became law. The experiment station law was not passed until 1887. The USDA has grown to eleven program agencies: agricultural research administration, commodity exchange authority, the extension service, the farm credit administration, the farmers home administration, the federal crop insurance corporation, the forest service, production and marketing administration, commodity credit corporation, the rural electrification administration and the soil conservation service, and nine staff and service agencies: Bureau of agricultural economics, office of budget and finance, the office of foreign agricultural relations, the office of hearing examiners, the office of information, the library, office of personnel, office of plant operations and the office of the solicitor.

All report directly to the Secretary of Agriculture--an unwieldly organization.

Many perform overlapping functions with field men at the local level. They should be combined to eliminate waste and confusion in minds of public. Also local advisory committees tend to become local administrative units.

One field man could represent all agencies. Administration, to eliminate local politics, could be done by employees of the USDA.

Newsmen could correct the abuses as they did with the recent potato fiasco. Once the public has the facts, it tends to have abuses corrected through elected representatives.

A SHORT REVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Principal interests of people in all times during recorded history has been how to make a living and what things affect a person's ability to make a living.

Stories telling and interpreting processes of producing and distributing wealth are no less vital today. Therefore, forceful farm editors must pay a great deal of attention to economic activities of farmers.

SAMPLE FARM AND TECHNICAL TERMS FARM REPORTER NEEDS TO KNOW

Covey, flock, herd, drove, pack, bevy. Rick, stack, sheaf, swath. Stallion, mare, foal, colt, gelding. Bull, cow, calve, calf, steer. Swine, boar, sow, farrow, pigs, barrow. Deadman. Woodpecker or beaver. Haywire outfit. Parity.

POLITICS IN AGRICULTURE

As early as 1852 a national agricultural organization began pressuring Congress for a department of agriculture. Ten years later, with the Civil War helping, the USDA was created.

Leading farm organizations now trying to influence legislation include American Farm Bureau Federation, National Farmers Union, National Co-op Council, and the National Grange. All have official publications which the

alert Farm Editor must get and study. They are important lobbyists for agricultural legislation. AFBF is most "right" of the four. AF Union is most "left."

A Look at the Present Farm Program and Some of Its Forerunners

Within lifetime of middle-aged farmers prices for basic crops have varied eight to one. Wheat has fluctuated between 44 cents and $3.33 a bushel; corn, 22 cents to $2.88; rye, 30 cents to $4.08, cotton 5 cents to 40 cents.

Something is needed to stabilize farm prices.

Industry restricts production. Farmers have not been able to do so. Farm programs have been political with prices high enough to hold the farmers vote--rather than based on world supply and demand. Legislation here cannot control foreign prices so government programs have failed.

Controls effectively curb exports, lead to isolation and economic nationalism.

American system has thrived on competition which results in surpluses with low prices and other complexities. To the author, this seems infinitely better than famine. Subsidies to farmers may seem justified from a study of tariffs, but it is one segment taking unearned economic advantage of another.

Past programs that have failed: devaluation of the dollar raised prices of manufactured goods, but not of farm products disposed of in foreign markets.

Destruction of livestock, despite democracy being associated with plenty; tyranny with scarcity and want.

The Ever-Normal granary, a misnamed device to increase income to farmers.

Subsistence payments in the guise of conservation payments.

Now a subsidy in form of supported prices.

VOTES CAST IN THE U. S. SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

From study of votes recorded over a ten-year period in the two houses of the United States Congress, the writer concluded that most votes are a bid for re-election.

Neither party affiliations, farm blocs nor other so-called divisions of either house will stand up on legislation affecting home states of senators or representatives.

Voting on a $250,000,000 fund for parity payments on wheat, corn, cotton, rice and tobacco, under Democratic sponsorship, Democratic congressmen joined Republicans in industrial states to defeat the bill. Republican and Democratic representatives from states producing the crops to be supported voted for it. The so-called farm bloc split to non-existence except in states whose major crops were to have been supported.

More crops were added to the support list before the legislation was favored by a majority.

The 1945 vote to defer agricultural workers, vetoed by Truman, illustrated how effectively the party can break the so-called farm bloc. Of the 186 who voted for passage over the President's veto, only 37 were Democrats.

Not a Republican Senator voted against the 1941 amendment to the National Defense Act to prohibit procurement of agricultural products outside of the United States. Forty-seven Democratic senators voted to defeat the bill. Again the farm bloc was split by the party whip.

A 1949 vote in the senate to make 90 percent parity mandatory, party legislation, passed when Vice President Barkley broke a 37-37 tie. This was farm legislation. But it appeared to be more of a Democratic vote with defections than a farm vote with defections.

Conclusion: neither the farm bloc nor party lines stand against legislation that is to be felt in the purse of constituents.

A Proposed Agricultural Journalism Curriculum

Using the Kansas State College curriculum in agricultural journalism as a foundation, the following curriculum was built after studying curriculum suggestions from working farm editors.

Freshman

First Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
Engl.	111	Written Comm. I	3
Comp.	111	Biol. in Rel. to Man I	4
Comp.	101	Man's Phys. World I	4
An. Husb.	126	El. of An. Husb.	2 and
An. Husb.	129	El. of An. Husb. Lab	1
Mil. Sc.	105	Military IA	1
Jour.	109	Journalism Lecture	R
Gen. Agr.	104	Freshman Assembly	R
Phys. Ed.	103	Phys. Education M	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
	Total		16

Second Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
Engl.	112	Written Comm. II	2
Comp.	112	Biol. in Rel. to Man II	4
Comp.	102	Man's Phys. World II	4
Dairy Husb.	101	El. of Dairying	3
Hort.	104	El. of Hort.	2
Hort.	105	El. of Hort. Lab	1
Mil. Sc.	106	Military IB	1
Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Phys. Ed.	103	Phys. Education M	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
	Total		17

Sophomore

First Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
History	105	Amer. Ind. History	3
Speech	103	Oral Comm.	2
Agron.	130	Soils	4
Poul. Husb.	104	Farm Poul. Prod.	2
	105	Farm Poul. Prod. Lab	1
Jour.	160	Agr. Journalism	3
Mil. Sc.		Military	1
Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Phys. Ed.	103	Phys. Education M	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
Total			16

Second Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
Sociology	156	Rural Sociology	3
An. Husb.	152	Prin. of Feeding	3
Agr. Engg.	108	Farm Machinery	3
Jour.	187	Reporting II	3
Ent.	107	Gen. Econ. Entomol	3
Mil. Sc.		Military	1
Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Phys. Ed.	103	Phys. Education M	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
Total			16

Junior

First Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
Econ.	101	Economics I	3
Agron.	106	Farm Crops	4
Jour.	269	Magazine Article Wrtng	2
Jour.	177	Prin. of Advertising	3
Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
Eng.	169	English Proficiency	R
Eng.	243	Advanced Grammar	3
Gov't.	252	Comparative Government	2
Total			17

Second Semester

	Course		Sem. Hrs.
Agr. Econ.	209	Agr. Policy	3
Agr. Econ.	202	Mktg. Farm Prod.	3
Jour.	149	News Photography	2
Jour.	162	Radio News	2 or
Jour.	181	Rural Press	2
Jour.	166	Editing	2

Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
Eng.	255	Cultural Reading	3 or
Eng.	170	English Literature I	3
Agr. Econ.	211	Agricultural Industries . .	2
Total			17

Senior

First Semester

Course			Sem. Hrs.
History	209	World Cultures I	3
Gov't.	206	American Political Parties .	3
Bot.	205	Plant Pathology I	3
Jour.	234	Reporting III	3
Eng.	281	World Classics	3
Jour.	199	Jour. Lecture	R
Gen. Agr.	103	Agr. Seminar*	R
		Electives	2
Total			17

Second Semester

Course			Sem. Hrs.
Econ.	224	International Trade	2
History	210	World Cultures II	3
Eng.	219	Advanced Composition	3
Eng.	228	Short Story I	3
Eng.	231	World Classics	3
		Electives	3 or
Eng.	174	American Literature II . . .	3
Total			17

---

*Four meetings each semester.

**At least three additional hours are to be elected in journalism, making a total of 27 hours.

Electives intended to strengthen the student in his fields of greatest interest may be selected from course offerings in agriculture, agricultural engineering, journalism, history and government, economics and sociology, speech and radio, graphic arts, including commercial illustration, and any of the basic or applied sciences relating to agriculture.

All students pursuing work leading to a degree in agricultural journalism are urged to spend two extra summer sessions to permit selection of electives and to have more time to participate during the regular terms in extra-curricular activities. Those reared on a farm should spend the third summer reporting for a small daily or large weekly newspaper. Those with urban backgrounds should accept farm day labor the third summer.

REFERENCES

Books

Farm editors indicated they have no use for technical books, or any other books other than the standard references, for use in backgrounding and interpreting farm news. They prefer, instead, to call experts and quote them.

Periodicals

Leading periodicals used by farm editors in backgrounding and interpretation of agricultural news are the Farm Journal, Country Gentleman, Successful Farming, Capper's Farmer, Wallace's Farmer, bulletins from agricultural colleges and the USDA.

Other magazines used (in order of importance) are American Farm Bureau Federation official news letter, Hoard's Dairyman, Soil Conservation, Cargill Crop Bulletins, Crops and Soils, The Furrow (John Deere), Kansas Farmer and other state agricultural magazines, Colliers, Agricultural News Letter (DuPont the National Grange Monthly, the Saturday Evening Post and others.

Sources of "Tips"

Farm editors surveyed listed "tip" preferences in this order: farmers, county extension agents, feed, fertilizer, and farm machinery dealers, vocational ag teachers, the agricultural extension service, leaders in farm organizations, etc.

Techniques and Qualifications

Photography

That the ability to take good pictures is an absolute pre-requisite for farm editors was almost a unanimous agreement by the farm editors surveyed.

Farm Background

Twenty-five respondents commented on the necessity of a farm background for a farm editor. Eleven said it was a pre-requisite; nine said there was no need for a farm background, five said it would be helpful.

A Broad Education

Eighteen of 27 respondents wanted any future assistant to have a broad general education including economics, marketing, sociology, political science, literature, and "spelling and grammar." Nearly all of the 27 were emphatic and definite in this requirement. The other nine who favored technical training were not strong in their sentiments.

Criticism of Journalism Students

Thirteen of 42 respondents criticized the product of the college journalism departments with such comments as "They do not respect experience," "They are trained for and geared to the 'big' stories," "They can't spell or write complete sentences," "They need training in digging beneath the surface and interpreting," "They do not expect low starting pay," "They should get less theory, more practical experience."

THE RADIO FARM EDITOR

Most responses from radio farm editors paralleled those of newspaper farm editors. Many wanted more speech and promotion in the curriculum. Few thought the ability to take pictures important.

Otherwise their opinions, their references, their sources for tips, etc., were much like those of the newspaper farm editors.

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

Farm editors, in curriculum suggestions, indicated they have philosophies similar to those of college professors. They, for the most part, want abroad education. In listing references, they are not consistent--because they are too busy to use political, historical, economic and sociological references. For the most part, they seemed unable to put their theories into practice. Perhaps, therefore, journalism instructors should become working newsmen each seventh year. Following the year's absence from the classroom, perhaps they could see and instruct with methods that would get theory and practice stirred into the stories for both rural and urban consumption.

Greed and selfishness are creating tensions among rural, urban and other segments of society. All segments are interdependent. Cooperation among them would advance all further toward their ideals. Teaching the interdependence through newspapers and in the class room seemed more important following the survey.